DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 203 CS 200 687

AUTHOR	Douglas, Wallace W.; And Others
TITLE	English: One Road or Many? Some Historical Reflections, Working Party Paper No. 3; Foreword, Report, Appendixes, and Supporting Papers.
INSTITUTION	Modern Language Association of America, New York, N.Y.; National Association for the Teaching of English (England).; National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.
PUB DATE	Sep 66
NOTE	94p.; Working papers of the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching and Learning of English (Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, Aug. 20-Sept. 16, 1966); For related documents see CS 200 684-86, and CS 200 688-200 700
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Ability Grouping; Conference Reports; Educational History; Elementary Education; English Curriculum; *English Instruction; *Grouping (Instructional Purposes); *Homogeneous Grouping; Secondary Education; *Student Grouping; Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS	*Dartmouth Seminar on the Teaching of English

ABSTRACT

This paper traces the origins of educational tracking, streaming, or grouping to the period between the report of the Committee of Ten in 1894 and the publication of the Cardinal Principles of Education in 1918. The analysis of grouping, in its origin and in its consequences for students, concludes that its effect on the subject of English has been catastrophic, its need is unproved, and its principles are of dubious character. While it is not suggested that grouping be dropped from the English curriculum, it is suggested that the subject of grouping receive careful analysis by English educators and researchers alike in order to determine whether it is a fitting response to student needs, backgrounds, and interests. A group statement, "Aims in English," demonstrates that the purposes of English instruction are at odds with the grouping process. Also included is a section on "Improvement and How to Achieve It." Appendixes cover such subjects as whether the objectives of the English courses should be the same for all students, including those who are college bound; the English room as workshop; an inductive approach to English language teaching; and the segregation of students on the basis of merit. (DD)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 082203

WORKING PARTY PAPER NO. 3

English: One Road or Many?

Some Historical Reflections

By

Wallace W. Douglas

If I correctly sense their temper and opinion, American teachers, and perhaps also those who prepare them, are by no means so open-minded about the techniques we have invented for doing "justice to the varying backgrounds, needs, and gifts of students" as seems to be implied by stating our third problem in the form of a question--"One Road or Many?"

To be fair, I should say that some American educators, those who are somewhat removed from the exigencies of the classroom or who are more open to the buffetings of political conflict, seem to be developing a little uneasiness about the social consequences of some of our roads; or at least they are becoming concerned about the effects homogeneous grouping has, in its most blatant form, on the children in our segregated schools and in the lower tracks of very large high schools serving communities with marked residential segregation.[1]

Teachers, however, are another matter. Most of them, of course, are more than aware of what is called "the struggle that has been going on since the beginning of the century to individualize instruction in the schools." And most of them believe with great devotion

CS 200 687

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

> that the idea of having all types of students deal with identical content may be ineffective. That students can work toward the same goals without necessarily utilizing the same content is generally conceded. Understandings, value(s), and skills toward which all students can make some degree of progress may be reached through the use of different subject matter for different students. For example, not every student in general education in English classes must read the same literary pieces.[2]

So far as my own experience goes--and, alas, I have no research to support me--American teachers would quite understand the headmaster in Nottingham who told Mr. Brian Jackson[3] that he found himself unable to identify critics of streaming because in thirty years of teaching he had never found any. I suspect that not much of a search would have to be made to find someone over here who would say as did another of Jackson's respondents who was also a headmaster, of a streamed school by the way, "You soon learn to pick out the children who are receptive and amendable to teaching, or in other words the intelligent ones, and there's your "A" stream for you." And perhaps there would be someone who would say, with a distinct no-nonsense, all-business air about him, that grouping is of most help to lower track children, because "The poorer the home, the more stupid the child. These children from poor homes grow up together, play together, and accept working together."[4]

Sizable numbers of Jackson's respondents identified opponents of grouping as "People in education who are not practicing teachers," "People with chips on their shoulders," and "People with left-wing sympathies." In specifying the first category, they used such interestingly toned phrases as the following: "These sociologists with no practical experience," "Ivory-towered lecturers in education," "The cranks of this world," "Extremists who pay homage to the ideal of equal opportunity," and "People who have studied at length the Apes and the Monkeys, and have been rewarded by Education

Authorities treating them as CHILD experts."[5] I am not confident that similar attitudes might not be expressed by many American teachers, especially those who work in metropolitan systems.

The mechanism that such beliefs defend-the mechanism by which we provide "general education for a highly diverse student body"[6]--seems to depend on three major and two minor articles of faith.

The first article is that the "varying backgrounds, needs, and gifts" that occur among children in any school population so affect both learning and teaching as to require modifications not merely in the grade-year organizations of schools, but also in the curricular content and teaching materials in use in schools.

The second article is that children having "varying backgrounds, needs, and gifts" may be sorted into meaningful categories of intellect[7] and motivation.[8] This article seems to depend on two subordinate ones: first, that the instruments and impressions used for classifying children for school purposes are both valid and reliable; second, that interpreters of the accepted data are able to make certain, or at least highly probable, predictions about the nature of the responses of various student groups, as defined by the school, to the activities that may or do go on in English classrooms.

The third article of faith concerns the teacher's beliefs about the content and materials of the curriculum, and probably also about his teaching techniques. It is this article which, in the end, makes classificatory schemes possible by providing an at least presumptively neutral proof of group characteristics. The system works in the following fashion. First,

there are the tests and opinions by which students are organized into groups. Second, the characteristics of these groups, whether assumed or observed, have to be capable of being brought into some kind of significant relationship to school activities. Or conversely, it must be possible to establish a relationship between student behavior in school and the characteristics of the groups they have been assigned to. Since intellectual qualities are purportedly what is being established, it must be the students' responses, actual or expected, in various classroom situations which are given as cause or confirmation of their prior classification. To be used so, subject matter, materials, and procedures must, separately or together, be regarded as having a value so absolute or general that norms of behavior toward them can be established, and indeed that sanctions against nonconformity are appropriate. To put it simply, the third article of faith is that the activities and happenings in an English classroom are such that a child's behavior there can be said to be a valid indicator of his intellectual capacities.

I

Perhaps none of these articles rests on any very firm foundation, and all of them need examination in the light of new research and observation.[9] It is, however, only the third, which has to do with curriculum, that teachers can reflect on with any certainty of being useful. That reflection about it would be of great use ought to go without saying. It should be obvious that we very much need to examine present school English-the materials, the content, the method, the objectives--to try to determine which of its properties are most closely tied to the complicated process of establishing categories of students. And we should ask also whether, or to what extent, the use made of English is a necessary consequence of its nature. Such an examination can-

not be limited to present conditions; it needs some kind of point of reference, lest universality be imputed to what is surely but local and temporary. I think the examination should go back to the years when the modern school structure was coming into being, that is to the quarter-century between 1894 and 1918. The first date marks the publication of the Report of the Committee of Ten, which may be considered as the last expression having to do with public secondary schools of the ancient literary-rhetorical tradition in education. The second date is that of the publication of the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, which though perhaps not always seen to be so, is still as close to a statement of the basic philosophical and social presuppositions of the modern school as anything we have.

In most respects, 1893-94 must have been an ordinary enough academic year, though perhaps fuller of portents of progress than most. In his annual report, the Commissioner of Education called attention to the "well-marked gain in school attendance" which had occurred even "during a period of widespread business depression," adding,

> and it speaks well for the people that they endeavor to make up for the loss occasioned by irregular and uncertain wages by sending to school not only the younger children at such times, but also their older children, thrown out of occupation as wage earners.

The increase over the previous year had been 425,258, or 3.15 percent. For the ten years ending in 1892-93, the average annual increase had been only about 286,000. As the Commissioner said, the increase "would seem to indicate that periods of 'hard times' have a favorable effect upon school attendance, numbers of children, perhaps from lack of remunerative labor,

being diverted from the factory or workshop to the school."[10]

As far as the Commissioner was concerned, the school growth rate seems to have been a thing very pleasing to reflect upon, at least insofar as it might be connected with the growth of cities. In the introduction to his report, the Commissioner recorded with satisfaction that between 1880 and 1890 the number of cities of more than 8,000 population in the North Atlantic and North Central states had increased by 118 to a total of 331; in the South Atlantic and South Central states the number had increased from 42 to 73. The Commissioner's enthusiasm seems to have been roused by a curious mixture of social forces, including the consequences of the early states of primitive accumulation and some results of a more or less mature industrialism. "It is the destiny of all civilization," he said rather grandly,

> to increase the number and size of its cities. It is the necessary result of the invention of machinery and labor-saving devices which flow from new discoveries in science, for the city is the necessary resort of the surplus laborers no longer necessary on the farm. . . . Instead of ninety-nine drudges producing raw material and one person working to furnish and diffuse directive intelligence, it will come to pass in the distant future that one man will, by the aid of machinery, furnish the raw material, another man's labor will make the useful articles for food, clothing, and shelter, ten more will elaborate articles of comfort and luxury, the rest, more than 80 per cent of the community, will take up vocations having to do with protection and culture. With the growth of cities, therefore, there is a rapid increase in educational facilities.[11]

The linkage between "protection and culture" is a little odd, not to say ominous. But apparently the Commissioner's attention was on the immediate, not the distant, future. What he wanted to emphasize was "the influence of cities on the length of school sessions and the location of schools at convenient distances." Cities, with their ten-month schools, would be an ex-

ample to rural districts in the South, as they already had been in New England. The increase in the number of cities would also hasten the consolidation of school districts, at least of those close enough to town centers to allow their children to be transported to town schools. It seems clear that the Commissioner was looking forward to the more efficient, more productive organization of teaching that he assumed to be possible in larger schools.

> In a small rural school no classification (by age into grades) can be attempted, and for the most part the pupils never get beyond the rudiments of reading, writing, and arithmetic. With good classification (or grading) the city teacher can teach from 40 to 60 pupils well. In the ungraded school not even 16 to 30 pupils can be well taught.[12]

But of course his ideal also meant the addition of pupils from wholly new classes of society.

In 1893-94 there were 13,935,977 children enrolled in the public school. But this was still only 69.39 percent of the age group from five to eighteen, and of the total, only 289,274 (including no more than 4,197 Negroes) were enrolled as secondary students. The average number of secondary students to a school was 73.13. So it is perhaps no wonder that the Commissioner showed no fear of what his dreams meant, that the schools were about to be overwhelmed by a mass of "individuals dissimilar in ability, aptitude, interest, and background," or that there was going to have to be an application of "the doctrine of individual differences to the provision of general education."[14]

Nor were "individual differences" of concern to the Committee of Ten.[15] The charge of the Committee had been to investigate the limits, the methods of instruction, the allotment of time, and the methods of testing found to be appropriate to the various subjects found in school programs and required

for college entrance. Nine subject-matter conferences were organized,[16] and the general charge was broken down for them into eleven specific questions. Only two of these may be said to have touched on the problems arising from individual needs and differences:

> 7. Should the subject be treated differently for pupils who are going to college, for those who are going to a scientific school, and for those who are, presumably, going to neither?
> 8. At what stage should this differentiation begin, if any be recommended?[17]

Members of the conferences--all ninety of them, from universities, colleges, normal schools, private and public secondary schools (both vocational and academic), and government offices--unanimously rejected Question No. 7 and (hence) No. 8. The Committee of Ten were unanimously in agreement with their Conferences:

> Ninety-eight[18] teachers, intimately concerned either with the actual work of American secondary schools, or with the results of that work as they appear in students who come to college, unanimously declare that every subject which is taught at all in secondary school should be taught in the same way and to the same extent to every pupil so long as he pursues it, no matter what the probable destination of the pupil may be, or at what point his education is to cease. . . . Not that all the pupils should pursue every subject for the same number of years; but so long as they do pursue it, they should all be treated alike.[19]

The Conference on English put the point succinctly, with no qualification: "There is no good reason why one of these three classes of students (academic, technical, terminal) should receive a training in their mother tongue different either in kind or in amount from that received by either of the other two classes."[20]

Considering the disrepute in which the report of the Committee is now often held, and lest "training in their mother tongue" be misinterpreted,

it may be appropriate to discuss the course of study the Conference envisioned as suitable for all the classes of students that it knew. What the Conference called the "main direct objects of the teaching of English" were two: first, "to enable the pupil to understand the expressed thoughts of others and to give expression to thoughts of his own"; and second, "to cultivate a taste for reading, to give the pupil some acquaintance with good literature, and to furnish him with the means of extending that acquaintance." Grade school pupils were to have work in language (usage) and composition, systematic grammar, and reading, or lessons in literature. In the high school, English was to consist of literature and composition, with grammar put off to one day a week in the fourth year. The Conference warned against reducing the study of literature to "the mechanical use of 'manuals' of literature" instead of "the study of the works of good authors." The Conference suggested including some work in the history of the language during the fourth year of high school, because it is "of value to the student who goes no farther than high school, as well as to the student preparing for college. It is to be remembered that the Conference recommendations on college requirements in English are treated in what amounts to a separate section at the end of the report."[21]

II

In February 1893, less than a year after the appointment of the Committee of Ten, W. H. Maxwell, Superintendent of Schools in Brooklyn, who had been a member of the English Conference, suggested to the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association that the analysis of the curriculum be extended to the primary and grammar schools. The committee which was a result of his motion was composed of twelve city superintendents,

one state superintendent, the President of the University of Illinois, and the Commissioner of Education; hence it was named the Committee of Fifteen. At its organizational meeting in Richmond, in February 1894, the Chairman (Maxwell) was authorized to appoint three subcommittees, one on the training of teachers, one on the correlation of elementary studies, and one on the organization of city school systems. The Subcommittee on the Correlation of Studies in Elementary Education consisted of W. T. Harris, Commissioner of Education; James M. Greenwood, Superintendent in Kansas City, Missouri; Charles B. Gilbert, Superintendent in St. Paul; Lewis H. Jones, Superintendent in Indianapolis; and Maxwell. Harris was chairman of the Subcommittee.[22]

Considering that its membership was drawn almost entirely from the upper levels of the school bureaucracy, and these from the Middle West, the Committee of Fifteen might be expected to have had rather different interests and values than the Committee of Ten. But the differences that do show up turn out to be more apparent than real, or to be of peripheral rather than central effect. The Committee of Fifteen was more openly concerned than its predecessor with the social context of the schools. At least so I interpret the following section of the report, in which, as part of a definition of correlation of studies, the Committee touched on the relation between studies and life:

> Your Committee understands by correlation of studies the selection and arrangement in orderly sequence of such objects of study as shall give the child an insight into the world that he lives in, and a command over its resources such as is obtained by a helpful co-operation with one's fellows. In a word, the chief consideration to which all others must be subordinated . . . is this requirement of the civilization into which the child is born, as determining not only what he shall study in school, but what habits and customs

> he shall be taught in the family before the school age arrives; as well as that he shall acquire a skilled acquaintance with some one of a definite series of trades, professions, or vocations in the years that follow school; and, furthermore, that this question of the relation of the pupil to his civilization determines what political duties he shall assume and what religious faith or spiritual aspirations shall be adopted for the conduct of life.[23]

Like its predecessor, the Committee of Fifteen circulated questions to " all persons throughout the country whose opinions might be considered as of value." Perhaps the social concerns of the new Committee are reflected in the content of its questions touching the problems of differences in the school population. Certainly the questions seem to hint of the direction that professional thought was to take when the effects of social differences became more evident. The relevant questions were:

> 4. Should the sequence of topics be determined by the logical development of the subject, or by the child's power to apperceive new ideas? Or to any extent by the evolutionary steps manifested by the race? If so, by the evolution of the race to which the child belongs, or that of the human race?
> 5. What should be the purpose of attempting a close correlation of studies?
> (a) To prevent duplication, eliminate non-essentials, and save time and effort?
> (b) To develop the apperceiving power of the mind?
> (c) To develop character--a purely ethical purpose?
> 14. Should any subject, or group of subjects, be treated differently for pupils who leave school at twelve, thirteen, or fourteen years of age, and for those who are going to high school?[24]

The curious fact is that the report of the Committee does not reflect the "important differences of opinion" that these questions, especially the last, created. The Committee reports that it had been unable to agree "on the question of whether pupils who leave school early should have a course of study different from the course of those who are to continue on into sec-

ondary and higher work." That is, of course, the very question that the Committee of Ten could reject without having to report any discussion. But in a way the Committee of Fifteen only takes longer to arrive at the same place. It gives seven lines to a statement of the thesis of those who argued that pupils "who leave early should have a more practical course," but forty-six lines to the thesis and argument of those who supported a uniform course of study. The values of studying Latin are used as supporting evidence.[25]

Apparently the arguments were persuasive; a majority of the parent committee adopted the following proposition: "If the community is at one on the course of study, all pupils should take the same branches of study, without any omission." The whole committee rejected the following proposition, which also bears on the issue: "The course of study for elementary schools should admit optional studies for the good of the pupil."[26]

Obviously the members of both committees were aware of some kinds of individual differences; if they weren't, why such questions as the ones just given here? Since the first committee found one of its categories of difference in the terminal high school student, and since the second committee found one of its categories in the early leaver and another, perhaps, in the ethnic minority, it seems fair to conclude that the nineteenth century teacher was not quite wholly blind to the class-tied behavior patterns that are such a trial today. Yet both these reports are quite scholastic, very discipline-centered. It is as if the members of the committees still thought to find in culture the leaven of society, the dissolver or at least the emollient of social differences.

III

Perhaps their hope wore out, or more likely the culture that the schools purveyed was gradually corrupted. At any rate it is a new world

that is addressed by the Cardinal Principles of Education.[27] This famous document, issued in 1918 as the ninth report from the Commission on the Re-organization of Secondary Education, is by no means overlooked by those who deal with American public education; how much it is looked over, however, I am not sure. It does indeed bear examination, not merely to show up the differences between it and the committees whose work I have been discussing, but also in itself, as it were. For it contains in brief all that is necessary to know in order to see the importance of social assumptions and analysis in the origin of the modern commitment to grouping of school children.

The very first sentence of the Cardinal Principles rings with the Commission's challenge to old verities and trusted procedures. The determinants of secondary education should be, the Commission says--and one wonders why not "shall be"?, for no lack of confidence is intended, that is clear--the determinants should be "the needs of the society to be served, the characters of the individuals to be educated, and the knowledge of educational theory and practice available."[28]

It is difficult to say which of these might have been the controlling assumption in the Commission's work. And perhaps, indeed, it was none of them, but rather the Commission's decision to treat the school as a model of society, or "prototype," as they put it. The principle is implicit in much of the analysis, and is stated explicitly in a passage summarizing their argument in support of the comprehensive high school. This kind of high school, which embraces "all curriculums in one organization," should remain the standard American high school because it is "the prototype of a democracy in which various groups must have a degree of self-consciousness as groups and yet be

federated into a larger whole through the recognition of common interests and ideals."[29]

I would be fascinating to speculate about the source of this model or the reason for it--whether it somehow embodies the ghost of Mancestrianism, or whether it is a nervous reaction to a spectre suddenly stalking in the East again.[30] But at the moment I shall simply try to get a little clearer understanding of the Commission's picture of society by trying to fill in the meanings it seems to have given to or found in the word "group."

At what I suppose might be called the manifest level, the Commission used the word to refer to the simplest kind of observable social collectivities. Though giving some notice to play groups, they emphasize chiefly the apparently basic ones of family, vocation, and civil affairs. So far as can be told, the Commission seems to have thought the groupness of family and vocation to be of the same order: that a man would feel himself to be a farmer or a shoe-worker in the same way he felt himself to be a Smith from Weehawken.

The needs and characteristics of such groups give one set of teaching objectives to the schools. Or at least the objectives are derived from the approved behavior of individuals as members of the groups. "Worthy home membership" means that the child should develop the "qualities that make the individual a worthy member of a family." The Commission is curiously silent on what those qualities are. Not so for civic education: it should develop such behavior patterns or values as "loyalty to ideals of civic righteousness," "good judgment as to means and methods that will promote one social end without defeating others," and "habits of cordial cooperation in social undertakings."[31]

This idealization of "social unification" is even clearer in the Commission's comment on the end of vocational education, preparing the child to fit into his vocational group:

> Vocational education should aim to develop an appreciation of the significance of the vocation to the community, and a clear conception of right relations between the members of a chosen vocation, between different vocational groups, between employer and employee, and between producer and consumer.[32]

A second layer of meaning in the word "group" seems to have been defined for the Commission by the massive increase in the school population that had occurred in the twenty-five years before its appointment. The result, the Commission saw, had been an actual qualitative change in the conditions of teaching. The schools were being entered by "large numbers of pupils" who differed among themselves and from earlier groups in, first, "capacities" and "aptitudes" and, second, "social heredity" and "destinies in life." In the large, these children comprised a group of "pupils who do not complete the full (high school) course but leave at various stages of advancement."[33]

In the world viewed by the Commission, such early leavers seemed likely to grow up quite outside the normal socializing process. The elementary school, "with its immature pupils," could not be expected to give them "the common knowledge, common ideals, and common interests essential to American democracy." The high school did not have them long enough. And, besides, it had for long been organized on disciplinary lines, with no sense of education as "a process of growth" or of schooling as (hence) "a preparation for life." Teaching in the unreformed secondary school could hardly, therefore, take care of the problems "of various groups of individuals as shown by aptitudes, abilities, and aspirations." And still less could it accomplish

the great end of education in a democracy, that of developing "in each individual the knowledge, interests, ideals, habits, and powers whereby he will find his place and use that place to shape both himself and society toward ever nobler ends."[34]

But to make matters worse, these "new children" went into a world where, in the view of the Commission, many of the agencies of socialization had been either altered or so weakened as to "afford less stimulus for education than heretofore," at least to those of such "society heredity" and "destinies in life" as the Commission saw flooding into the schools:

> In many vocations there have come such significant changes as the substitution of the factory system for the domestic system of industry; the use of machinery in place of manual labor; the high specialization of processes with a corresponding subdivision of labor; and the breakdown of the apprentice system. In connection with home and family life have frequently come lessened responsibility on the part of children; the withdrawal of the father and sometimes the mother from home occupations to the factory or store; and increased urbanization, resulting in a less unified family life.

The Commission mentioned, but did not detail, similar changes in community life and institutions.[35]

In the circumstances, as the Commission saw them, "extensive modifications of secondary education" seemed inperative. But, for what was proposed, "modification" was perhaps too mild a word. The proposed reforms meant, in the first place, that schooling was to be given up for education. Education itself was to be equated with growth, and its "main objectives" were to become more biological and ethical than intellectual. They were to be

> 1. Health. 2. Command of fundamental processes (reading, writing, computation, expression). 3. Worthy home membership. 4. Vocation. 5. Citizenship. 6. Worthy use of liesure. 7. Ethical character.[36]

Secondly, practical and immediate value became the explicit test of all school subjects. Deferred values were to be subordinated. The given reason was to help delay the time of school-leaving, since "in most communities doubt regarding the value of the work offered causes more pupils to leave school than economic necessity." The point is shrewd enough, and perhaps should have been more often thought of in the years of curriculum change that followed the Commission's report. At the same time, it does not seem likely that the Commission was here thinking of the value system of those it was planning for; rather it seems to have been expressing its own values. And it is a striking thing about the Cardinal Principles and the other documents associated with it that in none of them is there much feeling for self-consummatory experiences or, in spite of all the talk of the "worthy use of leisure," for school experiences really capable of expressing "the belief in the potential, and perchance unique, worth of the individual," as the Commission itself put it. Where the day-to-day work of the school is concerned, the Commission operated entirely within the limits of a calculus of production and profit, all directed toward the development of "those common ideas, common ideals, and common modes of thought, feeling, and action, whereby America, through a rich, unified, common life, may render her truest service to a world seeking for democracy among men and nations."[37]

Finally, there is the meaning of "group" that seems to have been developed as a consequence of, or in response to the requirements of, the reforms proposed by the Commission. These reforms meant, or recognized, a fundamental change in the social function of the American public secondary school. Formerly the secondary school had served as an institution of training.

Along with the private academy (and distinguished from the college-attached preparatory school), it had purveyed the fund of cultural and technical material that was regarded as necessary for entrance into the world of affairs. Some of its students were "finished" for jobs in government, business, education. Other students were "prepared" to go on to preprofessional study in the colleges. But the presence of such students in no way made the pre-reformation high school into a college preparatory school, as some of the reformers seem to have believed or anyway to have charged. Perhaps studies in the high school had to be "hard and disagreeable," and perhaps "a certain amount of ground" had to be covered simply for the sake of doing so. But it was no sense of "intellectual encounters to be met with in college days" that demanded such "steeling" of young minds. More likely it was simply the "dogma of intellectual discipline."[38] The mind was being prepared, right enough; but for the world as much as for college. What high school training meant was simply the acquisition of certain habits of mind, certain skills, and certain values which were deemed necessary for work; whether in the world or in a college was immaterial.

Perhaps Sam Slick's analysis of the school curriculum of an earlier day would still have been applicable:

> As for Latin and Greek, we don't valy it a cent; we teach it; and so we do painting and music, because the English do, and we like to go ahead on 'em even in them are things. As for reading, its well enough for them that has nothing to do, and writing is plaguy apt to bring a man to States-prison. . . . Cyphering is the thing-if a man knows how to cypher, he is sure to grow rich.[39]

Now, "after more than half a century of struggle," the high school, it was said, was to become a continuation of the common school, "a finishing school (in the good sense of that term) rather than a fitting school."[40] To

say that this meant the high school would have to become a custodial institution would, perhaps, be cruel. But still it is clear that the reformers conceived of the school simply as a location where the larger sorts of moral growth could take place:

> To consider moral values in education is to fix attention upon what should be the paramount aim. A schooling that imparts knowledge or develops skill or cultivates tests or intellectual aptitudes fails of its supreme object if it leaves its beneficiaries no better morally. In all their relationships present and future, that is, as schoolmates, as friends, as members of a family, as workers in their special vocations, as Americans, as world citizens, the greatest need of our boys and girls is character, the habitual disposition to choose those modes of behavior that most do honor to human dignity. Not simply to learn to tell the truth or to respect property rights, but to realize in ever more vital ways that the worth of life consists in the endeavor to live out in every sphere of conduct the noblest of which one is capable--this it is which gives education its highest meaning.[41]

It is to be noted that the moral ends of this growth were perhaps not quite so universal as is implied throughout that paragraph, except in the interesting mention of "property rights." The writer went on,

> Stated in terms of national service, the aim of the secondary school should be to equip our pupils as fully as possible with the habits, insights and ideals that will enable them to make America more true to its best traditions and hopes. To strengthen what is most admirable in the American character and to add to it should be the goal toward which all the activities are pointed. Hence the best contribution that any school can offer is to encourage every disposition toward worthy initiative and cooperation, and to provide all opportunity for the practice through which these habits and aptitudes are most surely ingrained. By a fortunate circumstance, leading features in our national life, such as our ideals of liberty and equality, and such traits as a distinct strain of chivalry, link themselves naturally with tendencies especially active in young people during their years in the secondary school. . . . By seizing every occasion therefore to give these promptings their best nurture, the school accomplishes two purposes that coincide: it makes a better America by

helping its pupils to make themselves better persons.[42]

Today, long after Mencken,[43] to say nothing of Veblen and Randolph Bourne, it is rather hard to believe that such oratorical flourishes could have been taken seriously as a proper basis for planning a curriculum and organizing a school. Yet so it was, and perhaps is.

As the writers of the Cardinal Principles remarked, "The objectives must determine the organization or else the organization will determine the objectives." The Commission seems to have feared that in a school organized according to subjects,

> there will be an over-valuation of the importance of subjects as such, and the tendency will be for each teacher to regard his function as merely that of leading the pupils to master a particular subject, rather than of using the subjects of study and the activities of the school as a means of achieving the objectives of education.[44]

The alternatives are clear, and quite in conformance with the utilitarian calculus of the reformers. In the new school, the subjects were to be transformed from objects of study into means or occasions for social and moral growth.

It followed that planning was not any longer to be done in terms of a more or less abstract analysis of what it has lately become fashionable to call the structure of the subject. Criteria were rather to be derived from the "individual differences in pupils and the varied needs of society." The two principles are really in radical conflict, as was to be discovered in the thirties. In addition, it is hard to see how any really serious attention to "individual" differences could lead to anything but curricular anarchy and, ultimately, the disruption of the school "house" as an important location for growth. Whether it follows in logic, I am not sure; certainly practical and expedient thinking would light easily on the solution snatched by the

reformers. They said, and the idea is not a simple one, that the individuality in the individual differences among students was less important than the similarities which could be found among, or imposed on, students so as to turn them from individuals into members of groups.

No doubt the reformers were led to this solution by their model of the high school as the "prototype" of a democratically organized society of accommodated groups. At any rate, in those comparatively unsophisticated days, it was a social and perhaps also a socializing principle that was decided upon as the means of determining groups within the school. The school was to be organized as a means of helping students "choose, at least tentatively, some field of human endeavor for special consideration." This meant, in part, giving a child a chance "to begin a survey of the activities of adult life and of his own aptitudes in connection therewith." In addition, there was to be some specialization by means of "differentiated curriculums," which were to be defined by vocational goals--"agricultural, business, clerical, industrial, fine-arts, and household arts." Provision was also to be made "for those having distinctively academic interests and needs."[45]

In stating the final meaning that was given "group" by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, it is necessary to remember their use of the terms "social heredity" and "destinies in life" and also their notion of the individual finding his place in life (see above, pp. 15 and 16). Having those details in mind and bringing them into connection with the principle of curricular differentiation that I have just mentioned, I can see only one conclusion. Pretty clearly the Commission was thinking of a school that would provide the training which had once been accomplished by the apprentice system and the structure of domestic

industry. Destroyed by a complex industrial system based on factory production (see above, p. 16), these usual methods for social sorting had to be replaced, no doubt; and probably the choice of the school to do the job was an obvious one; certainly it was ingenious. At any rate, the final definition of "group" might go something like this: "any collection of children who can be set off from other collections of children by reason of 'common aims and probable careers.'" In other words, "group" meant, in effect, "sub-division of a worker caste." It follows, I think, from the general pattern of the Commission's discussion, that the schooling of the members of these groups was not really to be determined by their own observed needs and interests as individuals, but rather by a certain few common needs and interests that, by assumption, could be alleged to be distributed more or less uniformly enough to allow for some coherence in planning. A curriculum, the Commission said, is

> a systematic arrangement of subjects, and courses in those subjects, both required and elective, extending through two or more years and designed for a group of pupils whose common aims and probable careers may properly differentiate a considerable part of their work from that of other groups in the school.46

IV

To a degree this meeting is itself, I suppose, testimony to the bankruptcy of the system whose origins I have been analyzing. Perhaps, after all these years, there is to be a revivification of the ideas and values in the reports of the Committee of Ten and the Committee of Fifteen. There would be some justice in such a turn. After all, it needs to be remembered that the Report of the Committee of Ten did carry the revolutionary assertion that "the study (of English) shall be in all respects as serious and informing as the study of Latin." And as one of its opponents remarked, though perhaps some-

what grudgingly, the report of the Conference on English was "largely instrumental in establishing English as an important study in the high school curriculum throughout the country."[47] But at the time and to the reformers, the Committee seemed to have spoken from the distant past, its suggestions to have been outmoded by the pressure of events.

Indeed, what else could be expected, considering the very powerful language that the reformers were using? Life was on their side, for one thing; for it seemed to them that education had to be "conceived as a process of growth." "Only when so conceived and so conducted can it become a preparation for life," the Commission added, perhaps tautologically. Those who ignored this principle were operating in the darkness of "formalism and sterility." The recommendations of the Committee of Ten, for example, were too much under the influence of the "dogma of formal discipline." The Committee "tended to foster a type of English study that practically ignored oral composition and subjects of expression drawn from the pupil's own experience, and that constantly applied to the study of literary masterpieces formal rhetorical categories."[48] Life and the growing child versus study, discipline, and mental training: the outcome of such a contest is determined before it begins.

To strengthen their position even more, the reformers could call democracy itself to their support. Thus James Fleming Hosic, who was Secretary of the National Council of Teachers of English and Chairman of the National Joint Committee on the Reorganization of English in the High Schools:

> The new view of the school course and of the aims and ideals of the teacher is merely one of the corollaries of our democratic theory, and hence is bound to work itself out to some decisive conclusion. The high school is rapidly becoming a common school. That is what it was first planned to be, and that is what the people seem now determined to make it.[49]

As it happens, the alliance between democracy and the proposed reforms is not terribly clear, or at least it had not always been so clear as it was to Hosic. In his report for 1872-73, W. T. Harris, then Superintendent of Schools in St. Louis, had thought it necessary to call attention to the possible consequences of some questions that were then being asked about the structure of the American educational system. Put in social terms, the question was whether, and to what extent, the American secondary school was to be converted into a device for further socialization of all the children of all the people and the differential training, to suit the needs of industry, of some of the children of some of the people. Put in educational terms, the question was whether the course of study in the common schools should be adapted to "the actual demands upon the citizen in after life" and "to the supposed destinies of the pupils."[50]

Harris' analysis of the situation in 1872 is an interesting one, in the light of the direction of later reforms. He speaks of the "peaceful victories of industry at Paris, London, and Vienna and the colossal victories of Prussian arms at Sadowa and Sedan." These, he says,

> have aroused statemen and political economists to the study of public education as essential to national strength in productive industry and in the field of battle as well. What this education should be, how far it should be carried, whether compulsory or not . . .--these and other kindred questions must be discussed in the light of fundamental principles.

> On the one hand it is contended, in the interest of productive industry, that the public schools, being for the masses who are destined to fill the ranks of common laborers, should give a semitechnical education and avoid the purely disciplinary studies. The latter should be reserved for private academies and preparatory schools founded by private enterprise and open to such of the community as can afford to patronize them. The higher education in this country conducted in its colleges and universities should, accordinto to this view, have no organic relation to the public school system, but only to the system of preparatory schools and academies supported by private wealth.

In such a system, Harris concluded, the segregation of the well-to-do "in a system of schools founded on a basis different from the public schools, having a different course of study, and supported in a radically different manner" would make the public schools "necessarily be the schools of a caste-of the proletariat-the class whose chief organ is the hand, and whose brains are educated solely to serve the hand better."[51]

I am not sure that it could be argued that Harris' comment does not describe and predict the ultimate effect, though perhaps not the immediate intention, of all present systems of handling whatever are the problems that come with the "varying backgrounds, needs, and interests" of students in socially comprehensive schools. And that effect, if so, might in itself be enough to force us into some questioning of the social values, especially today, of grouping children for purposes of teaching. But there is, I think, yet another reason to question grouping; and that is that, in practice and perhaps necessarily, grouping involves English teachers in philosophically unsound approaches to their several subjects (language, compositions, literature), the consequences of which we are only lately beginning to notice.

As I have noted above,[52] in the reformed school, criteria for curriculum planning were assertedly derived from the "individual differences in

pupils and the varied needs of society." Obviously, as I said, serious application of such criteria in curriculum planning could only lead to anarchy, or the most expensive teaching system ever devised. But not so in the classroom, not so in the day-to-day business of teaching. There, in all truth, questions, in their form, and answers, in their content, could realize the effects of the "individual differences in pupils and the varied needs of society." But the method that resulted was by no means soundly based or an adequate instrument for education, had that been the intention. Since education was defined as a process of growth,[53] teaching had to elicit signs of growth. But how was growth to be measured in a teaching situation where subject-mastery was regarded, at least in public, as a horrid sign of dark and gradgrindish days in education? The answer is obvious: by the child's comprehension of "the varied needs of society."

So far as English was concerned, the "varied needs" could easily be defined in more or less moral terms, generally connected with growth in thinking, taste, or judgment. The "purpose of educating the children of the many for life and life's occupations" could be defined as the inculcation of "skill in thinking, high ideals, right habits of conduct, healthy interests, and sensitiveness to the beautiful." That was Hosic, and no doubt he easily found his way to saying,

> Broadly speaking, it should be the purpose of every English teacher, first, to quicken the spirit and kindle the mind and imagination of his pupils, and to develop habits of weighing and judging human conduct with the hope of leading them to higher living; second, to supply the pupils with an effective tool for use in their future private and public life--i.e. to give them the best command of language which, under the circumstances, can be given them.[54]

The effects of this method can be seen in all English teaching, but nowhere more distinctly than in the handling of literary works, which is hardly unexpected, since, as was said by one of the reformers, "literature is especially rich in ethical values." It should be said that, for some, literature with all its moral values could still be less important than "reading related to the major interests and practical pursuits of everyday life." But I think it is safe to say that for most English teachers most of the time the test of a literary work is what is known as "the maturity of the idea" that it "presents." Surely most teachers would feel and would say pridefully,

> Great literature raises the problems and questions that have perplexed man through all history: for example, the relations between power and responsibility or the problem of undeserved human suffering. It presents the solutions and answers of the greatest minds the world has known. If the solutions and answers are not complete, they are the best we have. . . .
> As we read imaginative literature in English classes, we not only study the great ideas of Western men; we also share the feelings of <u>all</u> people in <u>all</u> times.[55]

"All" is a mighty big word; and I myself find it a little hard to understand how such cultural uniformitarianism can be accomodated to any strong interest in the "varying backgrounds, needs, and interests" of students.

The Commission's view of literature as a means of ethical improvement was supported by what I take to have been a psychological principle, that "stimulation of the imaginative and emotional faculties of the pupil is mainly dependent upon inducing him to identify himself in thought with the writer and (in narrative) with the characters."[56] From this comes the leading (that is, without answer) question designed to promote discussion.

Its type is "What do you think of --------?" or "Do you think that ----- should have ------?" or "What would you have done if you had been -------?" "or to take a real one: "Why do we admire Brutus in spite of his failure more than Mark Antony, the successful?"[57] The value of such questions is, of course, precisely that they do not have answers, and indeed aren't even real questions. In addition, they transfer attention from the comparative certainties of works to the expected uncertainties in responses from the group. They allow for different responses (not answers) which may be more or less complex, more or less mature. Thus together the questions and the responses provide occasion for observation of growth. That they lead to no understanding of works of art and indeed seem to deny the very nature of the experience of comprehending a work of art[58] is of no matter. They demonstrate the fact of individual differences; that is enough.

The method is no accident. If it is not a necessary accompaniment of grouping itself, it may pretty safely be said to have been one of the concomitant effects of the circumstances in which the decision to group came to be taken. As I read the record, the reason for, if not the purpose of, grouping was the need for a mechanism to aid in the assimilation of rural immigrants from Europe and the United States into the urban working class, and in the simultaneous acculturation of all three groups to the norms appropriate to their status in a complex industrial society. Hence in schooling all free values had to be merely subordinated to the social imperative, but in fact ignored if not actually derogated. Learning about language was not practical; so one of the activities of the English classroom became "language-learning," in the sense of acquiring the spoken forms of the received

dialect. The mere creation of works in writing was not practical; so another of the activities of the English classroom became developing power of effective expression, in the sense of acquiring the written forms of the received dialect. The transaction of comprehending a work was reduced to a means of encouraging and testing ethical growth.

As we know it today, grouping, it seems to me, is tainted in origin and in consequences. Its need is unproved. Its principles are of dubious character. Its social effects can at best be described as probably unfortunate. Its effect on the subject English has been catastrophic. I do not argue, however, that it should be dropped forthwith, though all my instincts, values, and feelings tell me to say so. But I doubt that we know enough even now to make such a decision, though evidence seems to me to be accumulating that should lead us that way. At this stage, however, it is probably safe to say only that the problem of "English: One Road or Many?" deserves more thought than it is getting; and I mean thought, not research, though I think we could do with quite a lot of that too.

FOOTNOTES

1. Richard Corbin, "Literacy, Literature, and the Disadvantaged," in Language Programs for the Disadvantaged (The Report of the NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged, Richard Corbin and Muriel Crosby, Cochairmen; Champaign, 1965), pp. 3-16. James R. Squire, "National Study of High School English Programs: A School for All Seasons," English Journal, LV (March 1966), 282-90, esp. pp. 289-90. Harold Howe II, "Education's Most Crucial Issue," an address before the Founder's Day Convocation, Teachers College, Columbia University, May 3, 1966; mimeographed copy, from U. S. Office of Education.

2. Alexander Frazier, ed., Ends and Issues, 1965-66 (Champaign, 1966), p. 36. See also the Proposal for the Conference, p. 16.

Maybe the same "understandings, value(s), and skills" can be "reached" by all students, even though different materials be used, if the "understandings, value(s), and skills" in question are social or moral. But the case is different for literary values. The experience of comprehending "Trees" is qualitatively different from the experience of comprehending "I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud." I suppose the reason for this is that the structures and forms of the two poems are different in quality as well as in kind. A student who has his reading deliberately limited, as a result of his classification, is being deprived.

3. In England, where official opinion may be somewhat less certain than in the United States, teachers in the primary schools still hold to streaming as one of the verities of systematic education. Mr. Brian Jackson reports that, in 1962, streaming was approved by 85% of 655 responding teachers and Heads from a rather wide sample of schools in England and Wales. (Brian

Jackson, Streaming, An Education System in Miniature (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964), p. 31.) All but twenty-four of the teachers were in streamed schools. There were 217 replies from Heads, 438 from classroom teachers.

As to official opinion, cf. pp. 149-50, where Jackson is commenting on the results of the rapid building of new schools after the Education Act of 1944. "The consequences for children in 'A,' 'B' or 'C' classes were somewhat ironical. On the one hand official reports became increasingly uneasy about the idea of children being streamed at all; largely, I think, because Inspectors saw so much cramming in 'A' classes and so much coarse teaching in 'C' classes. The 1945 The Nation's Schools (Ministry of Education Pamphlet No. 1) wonders uncertainly if 'grading on this basis may in future not appear so desirable as it does now.' And by 1959 Primary Education (H.M.S.O. 1959) is so uninvolved that it sees streaming as a principle 'peculiar to our own day,' and tactfully advises teachers that it is also possible to work profitably with normal classes of boys and girls in which all kinds and talents are mixed together."

At the same time, the new schools were large enough to provide head teachers two, three, or four rooms per year class; hence the opportunity to stream was increased at the same time as the need: "--primary school streaming appears to have spread with barely credible rapidity all over the country since 1945."

4. Jackson, Streaming, pp. 39, 56, 37.

5. Ibid., p. 40, 41.

6. Frazier, Ends and Issues, p. 36. Is the use of "general education" significant?

7. "Gifted," "academically talented," "average," "low average," "below

average," "mentally retarded."

8. "Under achievers." (And what of "over-achievers"?) Probably there should be listed here the various euphemistic names for children of unskilled workers, especially in agriculture, what might be called the "poverty caste" of our society: "culturally different," "educationally deprived, "underprivileged," "disadvantaged," "urban disadvantaged," "socially disadvantaged," "culturally deprived," "experience poor," "educationally underprivileged," "children with limited backgrounds," "the disaffected," "linguistically deficient," and so forth. I take some of the terms from Eddie G. Ponder, "Understanding the Language of the Culturally Disadvantaged Child," Elementary English, XXXXII (November 1965), pp. 769-74, 797, at p. 769 note.

9. The relationship between school abilities and social class has been known since the work of Sir Cyril Burt. Apparently we also need to pay attention to the work being done at, for example, the Institute for Developmental Studies in New York and at the Centre for the Study of Human Development at the University of London. I should suppose that we ought to be setting our minds to the problem of social inequality and its effect on inequalities in ability. This is a rather different question from "English: One Road or Many?"

10. Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1893-94 (Washington: GPO, 1896), p. xiv.

11. Ibid., pp. xvi, xvii.

12. Ibid., pp. xviii-xix.

13. Ibid., pp. 10, 34, 41, 85. The average per school for the U. S. is given as sixty-nine in the text, p. 34.

14. Frazier, Ends and Issues, p. 36

15. The Committee, of which C. W. Eliot was chairman, had been appointed

at a meeting of the National Education Association in Saratoga, New York, in the summer of 1892. In November, at a meeting at Columbia, the Committee organized nine subject matter Conferences. These met, at various institutions, December 28-30, 1892. The report was submitted in December 1893; it was published in the spring of 1894.

The Committee consisted of the following:

C. W. Eliot,	Harvard University
J. B. Angell,	University of Michigan
J. M. Taylor,	Vassar College
J. H. Baker,	University of Colorado
R. H. Jesse,	University of Missouri
	(All the above were presidents.)
John Tetlow,	Headmaster of the Girls' High School and the Girls' Latin School, Boston
J. C. Mackenzie,	Headmaster of Lawrenceville School
O. D. Robinson,	Principal, Albany, New York, High School
Henry C. King,	Oberlin College
W. T. Harris,	Commissioner of Education

(See Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies (of) the National Education Association (Washington: GPO, 1893), pp. 3-12; also Comm. of Education, Report, 1893-94, p. 469.

16. The English Conference, which met at Vassar, was composed of the following:

Frank A. Blackburn,	University of Chicago
George Lyman Kittredge,	Harvard University
Francis B. Gummere,	Haverford College

Edward A. Allen,	University of Missouri
Edward E. Hale,	University of Iowa
F. A. Barbour,	Michigan State Normal School, Ypsilanti
Charles L. Loos,	Dayton, Ohio, High School
W. H. Maxwell,	Superintendent of Schools, Brooklyn
Samuel Thurber,	Girls' High School, Boston

Thurber was Chairman; Kittredge, Secretary. (Report of the Committee of Ten, pp. 7-9.)

17. Ibid., p. 17.

18. The ten members of the Committee minus the Commissioner of Education; the ninety members of the Conferences minus a representative of the Weather Bureau, who sat with the Conference on Geography.

19. Report of the Committee of Ten, p. 17. The Committee and the Conferences were questioning the general custom of having "separate courses of study for pupils of supposed different destinations, the proportions of the several studies in the different courses being various."

20. Ibid., p. 93.

21. Ibid., pp. 86, 87, 90, 91. Some attention to formal rhetoric was also recommended, but without emphasis. For generations in American schools the time now spent on what is called "composition" had been taken up by the study of rhetoric; that is, memorizing the rules and principles of classical rhetoric that had persisted through the centuries. Even the "discipline-minded" Conference on English saw the uselessness of such activities.

On the use of manuals of literature, cf. the remark in the Report of the Committee of Fifteen (p. 86, see below Note 22) that literary study in the

high schools used too much time on literary biographies.

22. Report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education (New York: American Book Company for the National Education Association, 1895), pp. 7-8.

23. Ibid., p. 41; cf. p. 14, Proposition One.

24. Ibid., pp. 9, 10-12 and repeated on 157-8.

25. Ibid., pp. 14, 87-8. See p. 73 for more on Latin.

26. Ibid., p. 16.

27. Cardinal Principles of Education. Bureau of Education, Bulletin 1918. No. 35. Washington: GPO, 1918.

28. Ibid., p. 7.

29. Ibid., pp. 24, 26.

30. If the numbering system for Bureau of Education pamphlets means anything, the Cardinal Principles must have been issued after the Monthly Record of Current Education Publications, October 1918. The Record is No. 34; Cardinal Principles is No. 35.

31. Card. Princ., pp. 9-10, 16, 12, 20, 13.

32. Ibid., pp. 23, 13.

33. Ibid., pp. 8, 22.

34. Ibid., pp. 22, 15, 17, 27, 16, 21, 9.

35. Ibid., pp. 7-8.

36. Ibid., pp. 9, 10-11.

37. Ibid., pp. 16-17, 32.

38. J. F. Hosic, Reorganization of English in the Secondary Schools, U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin 1917, No. 2 (Washington: GPO, 1917), pp. 11f.

39. Thomas Chandler Haliburton, Judge Haliburton's Yankee Stories (Philadelphia 1844), pp. 31-2.

40. Hosic, Reorganization of English, p. 11.

41. Henry Neumann, Moral Values in Secondary Education, U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin 1917, No. 51 (Washington: GPO, 1918), p. 7. It is mentioned as representing Commission opinion in Card. Princ., p. 15.

42. Ibid., pp. 7-8. Cf. Card. Princ., p. 14.

43. See H. L. Mencken, "The Schoolma'm's Goal," a review of The Social Objectives of School English, by Charles S. Pendleton, Nashville: (1925), in Prejudices: Fifth Series (New York, 1926), pp. 141-46. Originally printed in The American Mercury, March, 1925.

"(Pendleton intended) to find out what the teachers who teach English hope to accomplish by teaching it. In other words, what, precisely, is the improvement that they propose to achieve in the pupils exposed to their art and mystery. Do they believe that the aim of teaching English is to increase the exact and beautiful use of the language? Or that it is to inculcate and augment patriotism? Or that it is to diminish sorrow in the home? Or that it has some other end, cultural, economic or military?"

According to Mencken, Pendleton found 1,581 objectives by checking textbooks, teachers, etc. The one that led all the rest was "The ability to spell correctly without hesitation all the ordinary words of one's writing vocabulary." Number 2 was "The ability to speak, in conversation, in complete sentences, not in broken phrases."

44. Card. Princ., p. 27.

45. Ibid., pp. 17, 18, 22. The reformers did not say how children and curriculums were to be matched. If I can judge from my own experience

in the early Thirties in a smallish (500) high school with academic, general, and commercial courses, it must have been intended that students should elect the course of study that fit their interests and "destinies." I cannot remember that we were told which curriculum was for us. On the other hand, in junior high school we had been classified into three sections according to intelligence test ratings; and it is a fact that those in the highest section went into the academic course. The one Negro in the class was in the commercial course.

But in general I imagine that assignment to curriculums had to wait for more sophistication in testing arrangements.

46. Ibid., p. 18 note.

47. Committee of Ten, p. 21; Hosic, Reorganization of Secondary English, p. 14.

48. Card. Princ., pp. 16-17; Hosic, Reorganization of Secondary English, p. 15.

49. Hosic, Reorganization of Secondary English, p. 5.

50. William T. Harris, "Educational Values," in Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1893-94 (Washington: GPO, 1896), pp. 617-37, at pp. 617, 618.

51. Ibid., p. 618. I have supplied a paragraph break at "On the one hand."

52. At p. 19.

53. Card. Princ., p. 16.

54. Hosic, Reorganization of Secondary English, pp. 20, 26; Preliminary Statements by Chairmen of Committees of the Commission of the National Education Association on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (Washington: GPO, 1913), p. 11. The statement is signed by Hosic.

55. Neumann, "Moral Values," p. 24; Dora V. Smith, "The Children's Literary Heritage," Elementary English, XXXXI (November 1964), 715-27 at p. 715; The Students' Right to Read (Champaign: NCTE, 1962), p. 11.

56. Hosic, Reorganization of Secondary Education, p. 47.

57. Neumann, "Moral Values," p. 25.

58. For a very perceptive comment on the instrumentalism in the profession's approach to literature, see Leonard A. Waters, S. J., "The Right to Read--As the NCTE Presents It," College English, XVII (November 1965), 161-63.

Foreward

As a group whose members come from the U.S., Canada, and England we find ourselves repelled by "streaming" or "grouping" (the more usual U.S. term). It is, of course, not to streaming alone, or even primarily, that we are opposed; our concern is rather with the whole complex of arrangements which involve selecting, sometimes as early as eleven, a limited number of children for an academic pattern of education while the others, not necessarily the weakest, receive a different and usually inferior type of education and are doomed to failure in advance. With such selection and rejection there tends to go an excessive concern for external examinations and the cramming necessary to pass these and qualify for the next stage. In England and Wales streaming has been the official policy until very recently, but this policy has recently begun to be reversed; in the U.S. the schools offer what is nominally the same education for all, but in fact much grouping, open or concealed, may be found from the beginning of the elementary school; in Canada such grouping is on the increase. Certainly we all have good reason for concern about the teaching or learning of English in streamed schools; a subject which depends so much on, and contributes so much to, a child's background of experience, interest, and ability cannot easily flourish in an atmosphere of anxiety, the pursuit of marks at any price, and--for many--failure.

For the struggle to achieve good English is as much one of environment and morale as of verbal intelligence. We are not reckless modernists eager to do away with the discipline of English; it is rather, as the recent College Board Study made clear, that disciplined communication will never be achieved if there is inadequate experience to communicate, or if the student does not have his heart in the job--and this presupposes awareness on his part that

the job is possible and worthwhile, and that he is making real progress. One other disclaimer: we should not dream of claiming that every student of a particular age or grade should always be doing the same work or even the same kind of work as all the others; but we think that the best way of achieving variety lies in the Workshop approach which is considered on a subsequent page.

The notes which follow begin with a brief survey of the aims of English teaching. These aims as we see them are incompatible with streaming, but to achieve them in practice will involve much more than administrative gesture. Improvement will involve effort at many points both outside the school system (the whole environment) and within it (e.g., school buildings and equipment, organization, and above all the preparation of the teacher for his task). The workshop approach to English that we look for should be within the capacity of ordinary as well as outstanding teachers, and should offer immense satisfaction; but we must give teachers* help, resources, and encouragement rather than just go on overburdening them. There remains much to find out about the teaching and learning of English in unstreamed situations.

---

*See APPENDIX 1 for a note on the account given by Lawrence A. Cremin of the reasons for the death of the Progressive Education Association; it is relevant for anyone concerned with reform in English.

AIMS IN ENGLISH

The English teacher should do what he can to foster the natural impulses in the child to explore his world (which includes his inner world), and to deal with it by language and associated skills. Much of his equipment to do this, of course, is already developed by the time he comes to school, and goes on developing outside school.

The teacher's aims will include:

1. To concern himself with the contribution which creativity as a source of insight and enrichment can make to the development of personality.
2. To foster that fluent literacy in speech and writing which can enable an individual to deal with the world, to possess works of literature, and to take in and give information. (Fluency here need not imply superficiality: the teacher should value that stumbling and confused expression which denotes tentative or exploratory thought.)
3. To communicate a delight in language and in using language, as well as some conscious respect for and understanding of language and the way in which it is still evolving.
4. To give his pupils sufficient possession of good works of literature, to give them some sense of the inheritance of civilization, and some touch with the comments of the finest minds on human experience.
5. To give them some experience of related arts--e.g., drama, mime, folksong.
6. To give his pupils some sense of discrimination, both generally and in the fields of popular culture and the mass media.
7. To foster a proper collaboration within his school between English and other subjects.

Professor John Fisher has asked us whether the objectives of the English course should be the same for students seeking entrance to university or college as for others, with the recognition that different students will achieve these objectives in different ways and to different degrees. Our answer is "yes," though such identity of aim is seldom to be found at the present time; there are many difficulties to overcome, including uncertainty on the part of the secondary school about just what in respect of English the universities really want from their students.*

If such fundamentally humane aims are accepted as providing a common basis for all English teaching, then the English teacher should be concerned with the same kind of process at every level; he will interpret the processes of teaching English in the dimension in which he is working. See Appendices.

His work will then be humane in content, helping to unify education generally and in this way to overcome division between kinds of human beings. Just because of this he will be particularly concerned with elements of organization which tend to vitiate his essential work.

---

*See Appendix 2 for a further note on this question.

Streaming or Sorting

One major obstacle to such aims is academic sorting*, which generates and reinforces feelings of failure and is associated with other social evils. A good deal of evidence (particularly evidence based on work done in the U.S.) suggests that any possible good influence of sorting upon the work even of the abler students is only marginal; its influence upon the work of the large middle range of students is bad. The learning of prepared answers, the lessening of real personal interest, the lowering of the standard which students set before themselves, and the lack of concern for English for its own sake, all these are among the symptoms. But it is the social effect of dividing children at a relatively early age into academic and non-academic "streams," and in the U.S. into corresponding groups, combined with severe shortage of places in the more academic forms of secondary and higher education, which has been so particularly harmful for education and English alike. One has only to look at much of the teaching and learning which goes on in streamed schools, in spite of great effort and some excellent work; the premature sense of failure in a divisive school can only prepare children for a divided society.

The Unsorted School and the English Workshop

To all this we oppose the unstreamed or unsorted school. Whereas streaming puts group against group, the unstreamed school, particularly through the workshop possibilities which arise in such a subject as English, can help the student to develop as an individual moving at his own rate and as a member of a group which has self-respect. Such an approach should involve none of the rancour or the sense of invidious distinction associated

---

* e.g., streaming, grouping, tracking.

with streaming. It presupposes a good deal of individual study, group-work, assignments and project work, as well as teaching and learning for part of the time in whole classes; the teacher can appear in other roles than that of just teaching at children, since for much of the time he will work with them. Language and literature have everything to gain from being studied in groups which are relatively diverse (in terms of ability, socio-economic status, dialect, etc.) for their size. And since the student will be gradually learning to take part in deciding for himself what to work at--with no set limit--students of very different ability can work well together. Both in the U.K. (at several stages) and in the U.S., there can be found examples of such working situations, and in the U.K. one can find many very young children as well as children at various older ages learning by degrees to work on their own.

Setting

Of course--as our Foreword makes clear--we appreciate that children are of very diverse interests and abilities. The English workshop approach in an unstreamed school is quite compatible with many kinds of "setting" as it is called in the U.K. This is the practice of taking students out of their normal class groups for particular subjects; a "set" may be formed as a sub-group within a particular class, but usually includes children from two or more classes. Such a practice must not be allowed to become little more than a particular kind of streaming, but when reasonably used it allows, as nothing else can, for special interests or aptitudes (e.g., a particular language, a branch of mathematics, a period in history, music) and should be a factor making for a more varied curriculum. We appreciate, too, that

children with special needs (e.g., the very backward child, the emotionally disturbed, the exceptionally gifted child) may need to be taken for at least part of their work in special groups.

Difficulties in the Way of Eliminating Sorting

Thus we are quite clear about our aim, the elimination of sorting. But for a long time to come it will be difficult to achieve this aim; in particular the English teacher will find it difficult to eliminate the widespread environmental and administrative conditions which make for streaming. Particularly serious are the consequences of adverse conditions which may have built up during the first few years of a child's life, including the first year or two at school; it may be almost impossible to overcome these consequences at a later stage. The preschooling period as well as the early years at school are therefore vital, and the most certain guarantee of solid progress, in academic work not less than in social development, will be a major effort beginning in the early years* and continuing subsequently to avert the disadvantages before they happen or to put them right at an early stage. Good practice in English must begin at the beginning and be built up gradually.

The disadvantages include:

1) Disadvantaged homes.
2) Philistine homes and the pressures in many communities which support segregation of all kinds.
3) Suppression of aspiration by many economic and cultural factors (e.g., the effect on adolescents of some aspects of popular culture).

---

*We have noted with much interest the concern of the U.S. Federal Government with the problems of young children and particularly Operation Headstart.

4) Preoccupation of great sectors of our society with material values.

5) Examinations, which reinforce the kinds of division established by sorting and influence the syllabus, making it less humane for the bright child and less rich for the average or dull child.

6) Over-formal syllabuses devoid of the essential human content of English work. In many schools such syllabuses make it impossible for teachers to teach humanely even if they wish to.

7) Physical and material factors: bad buildings or rooms, insufficient or poor books, etc.

8) Bad working conditions. First there is the prevalence of too large classes. We are of course not wedded to the proposition that the normal class group should be of any particular size; the size of the group should follow from the nature of the job to be done. But where a teacher meets 35 students per period 5 or 6 times a day, the kind of workshop approach which we have been suggesting becomes virtually impossible; one serious side-effect is to deter many (often among the most promising) students from choosing teaching as a vocation. The effect of lack of time for reading, preparation, follow-up, etc. is equally serious.

9) Lack of help, or hindrance, on the part of officials and administrators. The English teacher's work depends upon the services of others; there must be mutual understanding and confidence if he is to be able to work effectively; of course, it takes two to develop this, and the teacher has his part to play in improving relations.

The Teacher and His Problems

There are also the problems of the teacher himself. The difficulties inherent in the streamed school may be aggravated by professional snobbery or by such weaknesses on the part of the teacher as failure to do justice to the capacities of his students; some teaching seems to indicate resentment on the teacher's part against the less able for not being bright.

IMPROVEMENT AND HOW TO ACHIEVE IT

Improvement is clearly going to be a long, slow affair which will involve dealing with the difficulty mentioned above--and others. Thus examinations and syllabuses will need constant, close attention: we particularly endorse the recommendations concerning examinations made elsewhere in the Seminar and hope that Grading and Credits will also receive attention.

Working Conditions:

1) Better facilities for English teaching itself are urgently needed. What laboratories are for science, adequate teaching rooms are for English; they need equipment (including blackout, electrical connections, etc.), books,* space (not necessarily vast) for informal dramatic work and group studies. In few schools are such things found today; better provision will do more than most things to make possible better teaching and learning. And in such matters (and others, too) administrators, architects, etc. should be in touch with the teachers and prepared to listen.

The Teacher's needs:

2) All teachers need time and space in which to prepare their work, mark and discuss it, and relax with their colleagues. They should

---

*See Recommendations 1 and 2, p.13, High School Departments of English (NCTE). We do not refer in detail to subsequent recommendations of this report, but many of these are relevant throughout.

be relieved of unnecessary administrative chores which get in the way of the main job.* They should have more control of their own syllabus preparation and its contents, including the ordering of books. They should play a greater part in helping to train young teachers, but this is a job only for those who understand the less able student and his needs.

The whole team:

3) The teamwork within the school concerns everyone from Principal (or Head Teacher) to Custodian (or Caretaker). The teaching of English can be vitally affected, for better or worse, by everyone who works in a school; a less formal approach to English will not succeed without their cooperation.

Teacher training:

4) Teacher training (which is being considered by a separate group), is too often inadequate to the kind of approach we are seeking to promote. If they are to work successfully with less able children (or for that matter make English relevant in a humane way for undergraduates), teachers need to be more aware of what they are trying to do and more confident in the way they set about doing it. Present training involves too much lecturing, too much concern with method and theory, not enough work built round the use of words in exploring experience, not enough imaginative work and particularly poetry. More experience on the part of the student teacher of imaginative work, of literature, of teaching, and of

---

*See Up the Down Staircase by Bel Kaufman, Avon Books, New York, 1964.

children is essential; only so is he likely to be weaned from too great a reliance on syllabuses, text books, or formal work. It is equally important to get rid of the kind of "survey course" which leaves no time for reading books. Most vital of all is the need to encourage teachers, as students and later, to acquire more contact with the world outside education. As professional people, teachers need to be able to keep their own education up to date (in-service training, opportunities for further study, sabbaticals, etc.) and their minds alive. Their place in the community and their special needs call for sympathetic study.

Continuity:

5) A keener concern with continuity would ensure that more children would reach secondary school with sufficient experience of free exploratory methods in the elementary school--and that more children with such experience would find similar work awaiting them in the later stages of their education. It is particularly important that children should receive a vivid creative experience at the age when this comes most naturally; here is the best foundation for tackling more exacting disciplines later.

Research:

6) More research is needed on children's capacities, how they develop, and how they are affected by the conditions of school and home. Research and development studies should not only include objective studies but also take account of children's inner needs and difficulties. Problems of the less able need special attention.

All such studies call for something like sensitive literary critical judgment, some awareness of what the study of language and of psychology can offer--and perceptive insight generally. We should make it possible for more practicing teachers to play their part in such work; they see most of the children.

The Content of the Syllabus:

7) A central problem is the general lack of liberal and humane content in the English syllabus everywhere. The need for improvement here will, we hope, emerge plainly in other reports of this Seminar. For the effects of sorting, streaming, tracking will not ultimately be put right by administrative action itself, or by physical or material improvements, however necessary. The restoration of human awareness to English teaching would have an effect going beyond the English lesson and beyond school. For in the discussion of and response to such poems as Blake's "Poison Tree" or Coleridge's "Ancient Mariner" or Philip Larkin's "Whitsum Weddings" that all men are equal: a university professor could learn something from the comment of a "bottom track" child, if they met in the poem.

CONCLUSION

Without a much more vigorous and concerted effort the existing problems of divided schools in a divided society will never be solved; English has a vital part to play in the solution. This note has outlined a diagnosis and a number of needs; the former is serious, and the latter are urgent. It will take a long time to solve all the problems within English, but that is all the more reason for dealing with them vigorously.

We have drawn particular attention to the needs of the teacher of English. His task is at best a difficult one--much harder than is usually realized because English has so many aspects and overtones. At the moment he is often working under almost unbearable conditions; the recruiting problem will be more nearly solved when these can be tackled.

We need not think that even when the immediate difficulties have been solved anyone will be able to sit back. Will society, for example, be able to tolerate the increase of human potential likely to be released by a humane education in English and other subjects? What happens when a child learns at school to be creative in his approach to experience and then on leaving school finds himself unemployed or in a frustrating job, living confined in a ghetto or without fundamental rights?

If we are to discover the qualities of being which alone can really overcome the problems caused by division, education and English alike will surely have to become more creative, more concerned with imagination and the inner life. This need not mean that practical considerations are neglected; indeed the practical world would probably benefit from a better education all round. Nor is there any question of this kind of English

being a soft option: a concern for imagination does not mean any less regard for will and character or critical energy or independence of mind. The first rate needs to be pursued with "passionate intensity" now as always; there is no question of a levelling down for the sake of equality. It is rather that we are demanding a better education all round in which human beings are treated as human beings; everyone concerned with the teaching of English can help to encourage within a democracy the pursuit of excellence.

Report of Working Party 3

One Road or Many

Appendix I

Lawrence A. Cremin, in The Transformation of the School, Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957, gives the following reasons for the death of the Progressive Education Association:

(a) Schism, fragmentation, cliques, fanatics, and bandwagon behavior.

(b) The progressives knew better what they were against than what they were for.

(c) Their prescriptions and programmes made inordinate demands on the teacher's time and ability.

(d) Absorption into the main-stream.

(e) Swing to conservatism and mistrust of radicals--"Every thinker puts some portion of an apparently stable work in peril" (J. Dewey).

(f) Loss of lay support.

(g) [most important, say Cremin] progressivism failed to keep pace with the continuing transformation of American society. "The ultimate enemy of the conventional wisdom is not so much ideas as the march of events." (Galbraith) Cremin: the fifties were characterized by a quest for pluralism: and by vast increase in body of knowledge; schools' responsibility: to organize and transmit knowledge.

These comments are relevant for us. It would be as dangerous to neglect the very real risks which accompany any attempt at reform as to assume that, because "Progressivism" died, everything which progressivism stood for is necessarily dead, too. We hope not.

Appendix II

Should the objectives of the English courses be the same for all students including those bound for college?

The formulation of aims in our main report is relevant for all students including those seeking admission to university or college. But it is, of course, the case that at the present time in all our countries the objectives of university-bound students are different from those of the rest. For them objectives are conceived so much in being of ground to be covered, examinations to be passed, and standards of proficiency to be reached that English too often becomes a means to an end for potential English specialist (majors) and others alike.

The whole issue is complex. We do not claim that the English studies of those not going on to university are satisfactory of comparison; they often lack the standards and critical edge which association with abler students would give them. And to apply in practice the implications of saying that the English course is the same for all will be a long and difficult job. A great deal will depend on how much help can be given to the average or below average student early on, so that he will aim at more ambitious work later. The work of many U.S. curriculum study circles is concerned with this very process of evolution and this must be a gradual affair. But it does not follow that no thought or action is needed at the present time; the issue is verbal and urgent. We are not again thinking of any lowering of reasonable standards; on the contrary. And the able student should gain rather than suffer from more contact with the others. We therefore hope that many in the universities will join us in asking for a major effort along the lines suggested in our report, beginning now.

Meanwhile the universities themselves would gain if they could give the secondary school a clearer picture of what to aim at; this of course implies much closer cooperation than is general at present. Are universities initially concerned--is the U.S. at any rate concerned mainly with the English needs of the average university student who will not necessarily major in English literature? If so, the present state of Freshman English courses represents a problem which better English teaching lower down of the kind we envisage might help to solve. Or do they think of the potential English specialist? Probably the universities want a good general introduction with plenty of variety for all students rather than a premature specialism that has somehow drawn apart from what everyone else is doing. Do they always make this clear?

In the U.K. the relatively short duration (3 years) of the university course and the shortage of university places lead to somewhat different problems; but the predominance of A level examinations (taken in conjunction with the not very satisfactory O level) means in practice that a limited number of future specialists take a very highly specialized course, almost wholly in literature from the age of 16 or so (as one of two or more usually three such courses). Other students are often though not always required to pass an examination euphemistically called "Use of English" as a condition of university entrance. Perhaps the most serious immediate problem within this complex comes from the requirement which insists that the student, usually at an early stage of his sixth form work, should choose in order of priority six specific university courses; he can usually change later on if he wants to; but this requirement, a relatively new one, inflects in practice a particularly undesirable twist of the specialist screw at an absurdly early age.

It is to be hoped that in none of our countries do universities regard the English teaching and learning in secondary schools as a means for getting rid of two thirds of the three R's before the university is entered, so that the universities need not subsequently concern themselves with how a student reads or writes. Many aspects of both can, of course, only be practiced on the job. The secondary schools do sometimes form the impression that they are expected to get English out of the way instead of making a good general beginning; it is to be hoped that they are mistaken.

We plead for a much closer collaboration on equal terms between universities and schools in such matters; the universities have much to give and something to take.

Appendix III (i)

The English Room as Workshop

See Working Party 4, A Note on Classroom Conditions, by Tony Adams: what follows is addendum.

Prior to the arrival of the millenium, we shall have to adapt existing rooms as places in which to work in every way rather than merely to listen. The devitalized and sterilized austerity of many classrooms (or cells) must yield to a flexible, visually attractive, constantly changing room in which the artifacts of the pupils are used to create an attractive and enlivening environment.

Visual displays (N.B. collaboration with the art and craft or design department, with its printing press, etc.) can include items of linguistic, literary, and behavioral interest, e.g., a dialect-lexicon to which pupils add their findings, a news-sheet, film and T.V. reviews, advertisements (student exchanges, wanted, and for sale) and an ever-changing glossary of fugitive or transient slang-words.

A good classroom library is essential; this should contain fiction, poetry, reference books, magazines, and newspapers. A table for "sacred objects," flowers, grasses, models, etc. A generous provision of space for "virtual experiences"--e.g., tapes, records, pictures, photographs, etc. The room should be as much the pupil's room as it is the teacher's room.

Appendix III (ii)

A Note on U.S. Practice

In the U.S. at least 15% of the elementary schools are committed to unstreamed programs in the primary grades. In grades 4, 5, and 6, however, streaming usually begins, often on a basis of reading ability, and children are more likely to be grouped in certain subjects according to their attainments, spending part of their time on these sections and part of it with the entire class.

Jefferson County High School in Colorado is one example of a promising attempt to teach English without reference to grouping. Here they are experimenting with an unstreamed program which, thus far, has given students a genuine sense of excitement about English. The Jefferson pattern consists of many elective courses, each lasting six weeks. During the school year the student has six occasions for making a choice from such alternatives as Drama, Poetry, Shakespeare, etc., though one or two must be in the area of rhetoric and composition. Some loss of continuity may occur in this program, but it does bring together students of various interests and abilities. It also motivates the teacher by providing him with a range of courses to teach, activating his strengths and leading him to explore new areas.

Appendix III (iii)

Working in the English Workshop

1. Think of the class as something other than a homogenized class, as susceptible of numerous permutations, as individuals, as groups (both friendship groups, teacher-contrived groups, ability-and-aptitude groups, total-spectrum-groups) and as a class, e.g., as an audience of one "family" listening, say, to the story-teller, or as all engaged in one collaborative enterprise, e.g., compiling a local dialect survey.

2. See note on One Road or Many, dated 9/1/66.

This note was compressed, not to say runic. By way of expansion, consider item (i)--the primitive dialect survey (age approximately 13-14).

The activities involved in such a survey require varying levels of intellectual sophistication, and can be allocated to the pupils with these variations duly respected:

(a) Terms of affection.

(b) Terms of abuse.

(c) Taboos.

(d) Means of registering emphasis.

(e) Lexis of decaying occupations.

(f) Simpler more obvious aspects of local syntax, e.g., use of double negatives.

(g) Dialect metaphors and proverbs.

Some of these are simpler than others, ... whole class can engage profitably in such work (advice from linguists will be welcome).

The end-products can take various forms.

A simple dialect-dictionary, with illustrations both verbal and visual, is the most obvious. Dialect poems and stories are also appropriate; likewise, a compendium of folk-lore, folk-song, and of children's games, etc., involving language.

Appendix IV

An Inductive Approach to English Language Teaching

This paper described my own experience, and necessarily relates to university work, where issues of streaming do not arise, at least in the normally recognized forms. But it has features which lead me to think its methods could be used with less mature students. Notably it eliminates problems of pace which arise with deductive presentation--problems about how to pay out instruction so that every member of the class keeps in touch--it brings the students into the foreground as initiators of enquiry, and compels them to work together in groups of two or three, groups in which the academically able have no special pull. For all, its main attraction is that the work is always a work of discovery which cannot have been performed before. I can think of nothing more disheartening than carrying out routine exercises which one knows have yielded identical answers to previous generations of students.

It is no accident that my evidence comes from university experience. Teachers of English language in England are usually teachers in higher education starting from scratch in a nonschool subject. Unlike teachers of recognized nonschool subjects like philosophy they commonly have to contend with two hostile factors:

1. their students arrive thinking they know what study of English language is, and that they have done and done with it.
2. their students have not usually chosen to study English language (on what evidence could they base such a choice?) but face it as a compulsory concomitant of English literature, which they have chosen.

Such teachers are therefore to an exceptional degree (for higher education, that is) compelled to sell their subject to the consumer. For a long time I tried a range of ways of selling my subject by showing what it is and does, and how it is indispensable for reputable literary work. This got over to some people, but never had more than partial success. It was particularly futile for that substantial proportion of the students who were to become teachers. Even those who were converted rarely acquired a range of linguistic knowledge, a facility and at-homeness in it, that enabled them to take much from their university experience into the school. They still could not cope with questions about what to teach, when and to whom. There was a gap they could not bridge (quite apart from the "how" supplied by their professional training). I therefore looked at a different approach, which converts more people, and closes the gap for future teachers. At different age-levels the substance would have to vary, but my feeling is that the approach might be usable at any level. I propose to give a particular and egocentric account of this work, because some teachers have thought it usable.

When I receive my first year students I charge them all to buy the forthcoming issues of The Sunday Times and The Observer. I split them up into pairs and ask each pair to list any new words they find in a given section of the paper. I myself do likewise for the whole thing. The purpose is, first, to shake them in wrong assumptions about language, and second to raise all the issues that need to be raised in a year's introductory course on the history and structure of English. The actual identification of new words is something of a pretext. I list some of the matters raised:

1. No individual knows the currency of a lexical item.

2. If you turn to a dictionary for an objective standard of reference you find a) that dictionaries have different aims and methods (what is a good, or standard dictionary?) b) that there are demonstrable gaps in any dictionary. The determination of lexical acceptability is therefore by no means a simple matter.

3. What is discovered about dictionaries shows that it is rarely possible to determine that any particular lexical item really is new; neologisms are a particular class within the class of gaps in the lexical record, but we cannot often be sure that a given item is new. A normal issue of our two papers (omitting advertisements, financial and sports sections [see below]) will yield 200-300 items. People are staggered by the size of this yield: this is why they must know the issue was chosen blind (in advance of publication).

4. The teacher's list will always be larger than the students'. In other words, many of the forms in question are so unobtrusive that the students never even thought of investigating them. This is how word-formation works, and word-formation is the characteristic form of new material in the main text. What can be expected of a dictionary in the matter of recording such formations? Can general (grammatical) statements be made to relieve the lexicographer of this responsibility? (Try it for in-, un-, -er). If the interesting thing is not the actual formations, but the established status of a given pattern of formation, what can be said a) of the grammatical relations now embodied in formations (this leads in to grammar in the full range of its traditional senses) and b) of how these formation-patterns, and the patterns grammatical relationship they reflect, have developed over the centuries by processes of innovation analogous to those we can now trace?

5. The students' lists will also tend to be shorter because they think of words in terms of a single criterion of delimitation. But it is not a cut-and-dried question what is one word in terms of either chunks on the page or ranges of semantic coverage. The exercise compels students to recognize multiple criteria for "wordship", and again in this connection to reflect on what a dictionary's responsibilities are. There are many kinds of examples, but consider Great Train Robber. This is not Great-train robber not Great Train-robber, but executant of the great train robbery in other words it is a unitary back-formation from what is itself an ordinary three-word sequence.

6. Some of these larger units raise different kinds of questions - e.g., questions arising out of such punctuation-differences as that between a long, cool look and a long cold war. This leads in to questions about the linguistic function of punctuation, which again takes us into phonology and grammar. We have to ask about the relationship between sound and writing (not in terms of English having "such funny spelling") what sound-systems are operative (lead-in to intonation, stress, rhythm, as well as to segmental sounds). We meet questions (akin to those considered under 6) about the integrity (uninterruptability) of lexical units (e.g., when a newspaper uses too cultural brass where many speakers could only have cultural top brass). And questions about modes of semantic functioning (cf. such a structure as full Atlantic nuclear integration).

7. What of the discarded material? a) Advertising matter will afford a rich yield of items, and illustrate the same kind of issues as we have already raised. The reason for keeping it separate is that many students will feel the material to have a nonce, peripheral or restricted standing. If these items are counted there can be a feeling that the material looks bulky because it includes a lot that is "not really English." So we get our bulk without this, and then we face up to the issue raised by saying that some English is more English than other English. b) Departures from common usage and dictionary records in the finance and sports pages are essentially not of the word-formation, but of the metaphorical, type. Where new formations are understood and even invented without any necessary realization that they are new, metaphorical extensions require knowledge of two terms being brought into relationship, ignorance of one term blocks understanding. Thus, the investigation needs to be conducted by special teams (and cannot be supervised by me). This again shows something about structure and history. However, such metaphorical material does emerge elsewhere; it illustrates both structure and history, especially if one looks at the progress from living to dead metaphor (cf. New Cars in the Pipeline).
8. There will also be a residue of problems arising from other types of new formation (blends, loans, calques - New Waves) and from judging whether an established form has moved so far in meaning as to require a separate dictionary entry (lead-in to history of types of semantic change).
9. The whole issue should lead to discussion about the spoken and written varieties of English (lead-in to study of the whole range of dimensions of linguistic variation, synchronic and deachronic). A teacher (whether

college or university-trained) who has been grounded in this way during training should bring to his work a range of attitudes and assumptions which can be utilized at every level of work. How much formal and analytical study follows this initial training will depend on individual interests and aptitudes, the essential is to start from a body of questions rather than a body of knowledge. Then, whatever the teacher has learned can be used as appropriate; the other way the teacher is left with a fearful lack of confidence as a result of never having got beyond the threshold of a formal discipline.

Further Thoughts on the English Workshop

(These notes are written after discussion with Connie Rosen and Geoffrey Summerfield to whom I am much indebted. They supplement my paper in the Report of Working Party IV and Appendices III (i) and (iii) in the Report of Working Party III.)

1. Several points arise out of our discussion in the plenary session:

a) Is "Workshop" the best name to describe what we have in mind? It has associations with the crafts which might lend support to the idea that we see language only as a tool; also it is a word perhaps over-fashionable at present. To describe a new idea we need a new word: so far English "open-rooms" has been suggested, which incorporates many of our ideas. Any further suggestions?

b) Glyn Lewis has raised some objections met by a school operating the system in practice:

i) the danger of fragmentation in the English programme;

ii) the child's need to orientate himself to a particular person (David Holbrook's "loved adult");

iii) the value of shared experience.

It is hoped that the scheme outlined below meets these objections.

2. The "workshop method" can be operated within the bounds of a single class (30-40 pupils) or it can be combined with team teaching methods. To some extent the issues are separate and a rejection of team teaching does not invalidate the workshop approach. However, team teaching has many advantages:

a) It uses economically the resources and interests of the Staff and the facilities the school can provide - thus several classes can be combined to watch a film or a play, or listen to a broadcast;

b) It helps to solve the problem of the "average teacher" by making him part of a team where he can work alongside more experienced colleagues, making the Department itself a training ground; also it can aid morals by enabling the Department to discuss ideas and difficulties. It must lead also to more effective planning of sequences of lessons than might be achieved by the individual teacher working alone.

c) It increases the range of activities available at any one time to an individual pupil.

3. But, with this, concern for the individual pupil-teacher relationship must be maintained. Thus there is indeed still a place for the "home base" and for the class tutor who will undertake special responsibility for an individual child. Also intelligently devised and adequately kept records are essential so that each individual child's programme receives attention and a proper balance and progress in his work is maintained. Remember that there can be no homogeneous groups in reality; we need always to differentiate the programme in terms of individual pupils.

4. The team will nonetheless function as a unit with frequent discussion between its members of what is being achieved or where its failure lies and it will seek in particular to avoid the fragmentation envisaged by Glyn, for which there is no need if intelligent co-operative forward planning takes place.

5. The following sequence is one suggested mode of organization, amongst many possible ones:

a) The whole group comes together to receive an initial stimulus - a film, performance of a play, reading of literature, a broadcast, etc.

b) The group splits up into smaller groups (6-10 children perhaps in friendship groups) to carry out some activity directed initially by the teacher. Thus a series of relevant assignments of varying nature and difficulty may be proposed and duplicated for the groups to discuss and to choose from amongst, with the option being available of making suggestions themselves.

c) The groups now work on the assignments they have chosen and may need to split into sub-groups (perhaps pairs) or work as individuals. Throughout this the teacher is constantly present, circulating from one group to another; stimulating, correcting emphases, and "nudging." Connie suggests admirably that the teacher must always be able to inject things into the situation and that the child must feel free to reject what has been injected in favour of its own formulated ideas. Thus the teaching situation becomes a dialectic in which the teacher is involved as a participant, not simply as a spectator or instructor. He is engaged with individuals or groups on a joint task along with them.

During this work it is hoped:

i) that the most able and the least able can work alongside each other contributing together to whatever is achieved with the more able children helping and sharing with the others. (Note that the same children will not always be the most able at all activities; note too that this ideally means a rejection of any system of competition for "places" within a class--competition is replaced by cooperation);

ii) that there will be opportunity for individual and private work, and space to carry it out. We have a real responsibility to help children to work on their own;

iii) that the assignments will evolve along a series of successive stages so that a real sense and evidence of progress is maintained throughout.

The teacher's role here is a central one of guiding and assisting; but also the child must be assisted to gain a self-reliance and a freedom from dependence upon the teacher. A kind of self-propulsion is ultimately what is aimed at for the child.

d) At the conclusion of this phase of the work it is important for the whole group to come together again so that they can share in the enjoyment and the experience of the end-product that they have created. It may be an exhibition, or a play presentation, or a series of tapes, or a film, or a host of other things, but it is important that there should be some sense of achieved finality. The value ultimately lies in the doing rather than the achieving; nonetheless the children should be encouraged to aim at high standards though ones within their reach.

6. It will be noted that in such a series of lessons there is discernible pattern and sequence but one arising out of the logic of the situation. The alternative to a carefully structured programme is not of necessity always chaos; there will be occasions in the programme when one is working with a group of 120, or 60, or 30, or 5-6, or even one individual; English "skills" are being learned through practice and in a meaningful context with something to be achieved at the end. Thus it is "talk about something" or "writing about something" in a context, not just talk or writing with which we are concerned (Albert Lavin has a film made by children which amply demonstrates how much English activity of a variety of kinds must have gone into the preparation of the final product); above all no reason exists to suppose any

need for a loss of intellectual rigour or discipline in this work. It is as far as it could be from the now-dead "progressivism" or "free activity."

7. The provision of facilities as Geoffrey Summerfield and myself have indicated is vital, especially with respect to space and time: we cannot compartmentalize into one classroom or a 40 minute period. We need too to explore the use of teaching machines and programmes for individual work and similarly the more extensive use of headphones for receiving instruction. We need a totally new concept of the "textbook" or provision of teacher-pupil materials. Above all we need an easy, though not easy-going, civilized atmosphere in the classroom where there is room for give-and-take and plenty of informal contact between the teacher and the taught. It is this freedom and flexibility of a psychological as well as a physical nature that could be a major contribution of the "disappearing classroom" to education in English.

8. Finally I would put on record my conviction that this kind of teaching is the only kind that makes sense of mixed ability sets in a totally unstreamed teaching situation and that only a totally unstreamed teaching situation makes sense of it. I hope that the Seminar will go on record as endorsing, and strengthening, the conclusions of Working Party III on streaming and that it will view too differential setting with considerable suspicion.

One Road and Many

1. General Statement - very abstract - of content of English, of what goes on in the "English" room, conceived of as workshop.

   (a) Conversation, inclusive; the importance of listening.

   (b) Reading aloud by the teacher - of stories, poems, etc.

   (c) Reading by pupils - silent, extensive reading.

   (d) Reading aloud by pupils - "I liked this; would you like to hear it?" cf. Frost's "You Come Too" - a pleasure shared.

   (e) Making: poems, stories, autobiography, newspapers, notices, songs, film scripts, plays, scripts for tape-recording, reports, experimental forms, etc., etc.

   (f) Looking, observing, organizing perception, accounting.

   (g) Oral work of many kinds - both communicative and expressive (see Raymond Williams' The Long Revolution, Chapter One: The Creative Mind).

   (h) Mime, and drama - improvisation, psychodrama, etc.

   (i) Collecting, reporting back, collecting and comparing (e.g. a dialect survey by the pupils of dialect words still current in their locality). See George Evans, Ask the Fellows Who Cut the Hay (Faber paperback).

   (j) Concentration, intensive focussing of the mind, etc., on a picture, poem, object, etc.

   (k) Singing - e.g. folk-songs, appropriate to context.

(l) Explaining - e.g. how to keep a pet snake, or how to travel on the bus without paying for your ticket.

Notes: 1. Many of these activities occur in English teaching from age 5 to age 25 or 35 or . . . . .

2. Many of these activities can be effectively pursued in mixed ability (untracked) classes (e.g. especially a, b, c, e, f, g, h, i, j, k).

N.B.: Thinking of a homogenized class as an indivisible group gets in the way.

2. Brief account of Mr. Tom Haggit's work with unstressed mixed ability classes in a junior school in a slum-clearance area, in a school where the average I.Q. of all the pupils is below 100.

In the context of word-saturation, through plenty of silent reading, a good class library, teacher reading aloud with pleasure and expressive competence, etc., the class work on such as the following: (they work in groups of 4 or 5; sometimes based on friendship groups, at other times designated by T.H. to ensure a cross section of the total spectrum of ability). (See (a), (e), (f), (g), (i), (j), (e), above.)

Each crew forms the "crew" of a trawler or drifter.

They paint huge murals of the sea, with fish, whales, dolphins, crabs, seaweed galore. They also make a large map of the North Sea, with lines of latitude and longitude marked. They listen to sea music, Debussy's In Me, V.W.'s Sea Symphony, etc.

Each crew elects or is given a captain.

He dips into the "lucky dip" for the crew's first instructions, e.g. to set sail for 20° N, 10° E, at 10 knots. They mark their positions on the map (placed horizontally on trestles) with model boats, which they themselves make. They keep a log, and send wireless messages back to port. 4 the "battery is low," these have to be reduced to vary brief precis.

They continue to dip into the "lucky dip," and take out such items as: "Storm; winds, force 7, from N. E. drives boat off-course to such and such a position."

"Mathematical problems are introduced; they are also asked to write an account of their activities, a description of the storm, sea-shanties, etc.

The dip eventually gives them information about their catch, and when they get back to port they are given the day's fish prices and calculate the value of their catch. They then calculate wages. They finally take a real trip to Hull and visit the docks. For a fuller account, see

Cutforth and Battersby, Children & Books

Blackwell

Teachers of English language in England are usually teachers in higher education starting from scratch in a non-school subject. Unlike teachers of the recognised non-school subjects like philosophy they have commonly to contend with two hostile factors:

1. their students arrive thinking they know what study of English language is, and that they have had it and had it - and are done with it.
2. their students have not usually chosen to study English language, but face it as a compulsory concomitant of English literature, which they have chosen.

Such teachers are therefore to an exceptional degree (exceptional for higher education, that is) compelled to sell their subject to the consumer.

To descend to the particular: I tried over eighteen years a range of ways of selling my subject through showing what it is, what it does, and how it is indispensable for advanced literary study. This got over to some people but never had more than partial success. If we think of that substantial proportion of students of English who are destined to become teachers of English, even those who were converted rarely acquired a range of linguistic knowledge, a facility and at-homeness with it, that enabled them to take much from their university experience which could be of direct use in school. They still had to face questions of what to teach, when and to whom; there was a gap they could not bridge. I therefore looked at a different approach, which converts more people, and closes the gap for future teachers. My feeling would be that this approach would work for any level from five pars upwards,

though of course the substance would vary. I propose to give a very particular and egocentric account of this work because some teachers I have discussed it with have thought it usable.

When I receive my first year students I charge them all to buy the forthcoming issues of The Sunday Times and The Observer. I split them up into pairs and ask each pair to list any new words they find in a given section of the paper; I myself do likewise for the whole thing. The purpose is, first, to shake them in wrong assumptions about language, and second to raise all the issues that need to be raised in a year's introductory course on the history and structure of English. The actual identification of new words is something of a pretext. I list some of the matters raised:

1. No individual knows the currency of a lexical item.
2. If you turn to a dictionary for an objective standard of reference you find a) that dictionaries have different aims and methods (what is a good, or standard dictionary?) b) that there are demonstrable gaps in any dictionary. Lexical acceptability is not, therefore, a simple matter to determine.
3. We must distinguish between lexical innovations (which is hard to establish) and gaps in the lexical record, which are easy to establish, and which include the innovations. From a normal newspaper issue, the standard text (omitting advertisements, financial and sports sections) will yield 200 to 300 items, the teacher's list being larger than the students'. People are staggered by the size of this yield: this is why they must know the issue was chosen blind (in advance of publication).

4. The larger list for the teacher means that there are many forms so unobtrusive that students failed to investigate them. This is how word-formation works, and word-formation is the characteristic form of new material in our text. What can be expected of a dictionary in the matter of recording such formations? Can general (grammatical) statements be made to relieve the lexicographer of this responsibility? (Try it for in-, un-, -er) If the interesting thing is not the actual formations but the pattern of formations, what can be said a) of the grammatical relations now implied in word-formation (this brings us into grammar in the traditional sense) and of how these patterns are, and have been, built up in the speech-community.

5. Also, the students tend to miss items because they tend to think of words in the written delimitations. But these are not consistent, and we must be prepared to find items across "word" divisions (convenience food, host mother), so what do we really mean by word? What is the dictionary's responsibility here?

6. Some of these larger units raise different kinds of questions - eg. arising out of such punctuation-differences as that between a long, cool look and a long cold war. What is the linguistic function of punctuation? What is the relationship between sound and writing (not only in terms of English having such funny spelling)? What sound systems are operative (lead-in to intonation, stress, rhythm, as well as to segmental sound)? Or questions about the integrity of lexical

units (a newspaper using top cultural brass, where some could only use cultural top brass; lead-in to the rules of order in the nominal group).

7. What of the discounted material? a) Advertising matter will afford a rich yield of items, but the students will feel them to have a nonce, peripheral, or restricted standing. If these items are counted there can be a feeling that the material looks bulky because it includes a lot that is "not really English." So we get our bulk without this, and then we face up to the issues raised by saying that some English is more English than other. b) departures from common usage and dictionary records in the finance and sports pages are essentially not of the word-formation, but of the metaphorical, type. Where new formations are understood and even invented without any necessary realisation that they are new, metaphorical extentions require knowledge of two terms being brought into relationship; ignorance of one term blocks understanding. Thus, the investigation needs to be conducted by special teams (and cannot be supervised by me). This again shows something about structure and history.

8. There will also be a residue of problems arising from other types of new formation (blends, loans, calques) and from judging whether an established form has moved so far in meaning as to require a separate dictionary entry (lead-in to history of types of semantic change).

9. The whole issue should lead to discussion about the spoken and written varieties of English (lead-in to study of the whole range of dimensions of linguistic variation, synchronic and diachronic). A

teacher (whether college or university-trained) who has been grounded in this way during training should bring to his work a range of attitudes and assumptions which can be utilised at every level of work. How much formal and analytical study follows this initial training will depend on individual interest and aptitudes; the essential is to start from a body of questions rather than a body of knowledge. Then, whatever the teacher has learnt can be used as appropriate; the other way the teacher is left with a fearful lack of confidence as a result of never having got beyond the threshold of a formal discipline.

Aims in English

The English teacher should do what he can to foster the natural impulses in the child to explore his world (which includes his inner world), and to deal with it by language and associated skills. Much of his equipment to do this, of course, is already developed by the time he comes to school, and goes on developing outside school.

The teacher's aims will include:

1. To concern himself with the contribution that creativity as a source of insight and enrichment can make to the development of personality.
2. To foster that fluent literacy in speech and writing which can enable an individual to deal with the world, to possess works of literature, and to take in and give information. (Fluency here need not imply superficiality: the teacher should value that stumbling and confused expression which denotes tentative or exploratory thought.)
3. To seek to give his pupils sufficient possession of good works of literature, to give them some sense of the inheritance of civilization, and some touch with the comments of the finest minds on human experience.
4. To seek to give them some experience of other related arts - e.g. folksong and drama.
5. To give his pupils some sense of discrimination, especially over popular culture and the mass media.

6. He should try to communicate a delight in language and in using language, and some conscious respect for, and understanding of, language.

For practical aims and suggested exercises, see English for Maturity

pages: 26-28

page : 80

pages: 128-132

pages: 160-161

pages: 200-201

A Note on Segregation

My doubts about segregation based on merit arise from considerations to do with identity and the inner life. I found in teaching "bottom stream" children that the effect on them of having been placed in low classes all the way through their school life was depressing - in the psychological sense of feeling that the world was too much against them, and that they did not have the resources to deal with it; that they were not good enough; that the world was not benign. It made it harder for them to persuade themselves, or for them to discover, that they were "whole" and "good." And so it made it harder for them to discover and employ such potentialities as they had, which were often valuable ones, and included deep and fine feelings. I came to feel that if our society treats a quarter of its children like this, then there is something gravely wrong with prevalent attitudes to human beings. Not only were potentialities being wasted, but the whole civilization was perhaps failing to sustain an adequate enough conception of Man.

I found that my pupils were obsessed with persuading themselves that they could be good and golden:

my family is good them are good people. . .

O how I wish that was my yellow bird! . . .

I am the gut boy. . .

she was the bravist one. . .

And I came to feel that these aspirations matched those of the adult creative writer. Everyone has a need to maintain a sense of a continuing and sound identity. One source of this impulse would seem to be the backlog we carry

over from the first stages of glimmerings of the sense of identity. When the identity first emerges it begins to do so before the capacity for symbolism is developed, for obviously an infant who cannot recognize the difference between the me and the not-me cannot symbolize, since to do so requires some sense of the boundaries of the self, of the distinction between the self and another, and between things. (Some schizophrenic patients cannot distinguish between word, thing, and self.) The identity also emerges at first from a situation in which it is crucial that the child becomes convinced that he is loved for his own sake, and that he is therefore "whole" and "good" enough to survive. Thus, once the capacity to symbolize is developed, there is a large backlog, already, of inward problems to do with identity and wholeness, on which the capacity for symbolism needs to be exerted. This in part explains the natural delight children have in symbolism, because it can from the beginning bring peace and order to the inward darkness and chaos. We continually need to do "psychic work" on this kind of problem for the rest of our lives.

Where we disallow or undermine the possibilities of feeling "whole" and "good" in individuals we undermine their very identity, and can do grave damage, and Dickens knew. Yet this is what a phenomenon as streaming does at worst (and, perhaps I may add, it is what I believe much bad commercial culture does too).

The trouble with our kind of society is that it favours activity by which we set out to solve problems of identity by "becoming." That is, accumulation, outer prowess, action, and "outer goodness" are resorted to, to solve problems which can only be solved in terms of "inner goodness." That is, we seek to develop a sense of identity by outward resources rather than by inner ones.

We are so accustomed to this pattern that we find it hard to imagine any other - yet when we encounter other communities we may find this essential difference makes it impossible for us to meet them in any real sense. As Sol Tax says in Group Identity and Educating the Disadvantaged:

> The people who are considered by our society to have gone furthest are the ones willing to leave home and family to seek further progress and to make something more of themselves. . . .we have to become something. And beyond this is our whole notion of responsibility, our suggestion that everyone is responsible for his own soul. That notion of becoming, instead of simply being, is utterly foreign to Indians, and is anathema, because you only become something at the expense of somebody.
>
> Language Programmes for the Disadvantaged, NCTE, p. 208.

As Sol Tax points out, the Indian child in a classroom does not try to get ahead of his fellows, because he does not know how to do it. It is not part of his thinking.

Obviously we cannot now undo this way of developing identity in the Western World. But we can examine it critically, where it seems to do us harm (fundamentally I believe this problem to be one which underlies the problem of war and peace and so of human survival). There do seem to be consequences of the impulse which we value so much, to seek to be preeminent in terms of external exertion, and by incorporation - often at the expense of others who must then fall behind, and who are certainly taken from. I see this as a human system based on primitive hate - that is, on the first unmodified impulses in the infant to deal with the world by incorporating it, subjecting it to oral sadism, eating out of it those elements with which he cannot come to terms. To develop to maturity the individual needs to become

disillusioned about this impulse: the world cannot be eaten away by us, for we are only weak, puny and mortal. We can only live with the world, more or less imperfectly: this we need to accept, for sanity. It is the Hitler who continues to believe that he can magically subdue the world to the eating-up impulses of primitive hate. (Also such hate-impulses become the mythical center for such commercially exploited phantasies as those of Ian Fleming, because our world is essentially based on them.)

With those who fall behind in the struggle to "become" we discover the bitter consequences. Those whose potentialities are limited by the boundaries of the ghetto or class barrier, or whose preeminence in a society (based on "becoming") is limited by their deficiency of intellectual endowment, unhappiness, mental illness, or lack of the approved kind of aggressiveness - these are left with an agonized problem of how to maintain an adequate sense of identity. It is a proportion of these who take to the gangs of blousons noirs, and find a collective sense of identity in alienating themselves from society by violence. The commercial exploitation of pop cults is a way of making money out of their predicament without supplying any real opportunities for engagement with the essential problem of discovering an identity. War and such developments as the Hitler Jugend in the past have been other forms of exploitation of the discomforts of feeling the terrors of weakness of identity, in the world of becoming. (Notice how recruiting posters play on these schizoid fears: what the Marines make of a man. . . "join the daring ones," etc.)

Obviously, if this problem of frustration of potentialities for finding an adequate identity is as deep as this in our society, then mere organizational

changes such as the abolition of streaming are not going to alleviate it. Of course, we must remove anomalies where we can, and so unstreaming and desegregation will have a positive effect. But the content of education even so will remain preoccupied with preparation for a society of "becoming" rather than "being." Unstreaming, etc. could be no more than a futile symbolic gesture at the deeper problem, which has been only partially glimpsed.

But where the content of education itself in consequence of a concern with the individual realization of potentialities begins to become more humane and creative (as English teaching has in England), then, I believe, we may make some progress at least towards helping to overcome the anguish of the "dregs" or "also rans" about the problems of identity - at whatever level, from elementary school to university. Such a change, however, cannot achieve much if its aim is merely to generate relaxation and "social adjustment." In demanding opportunities, as through a truly liberal and creative education, providing for inner needs, for release of potentialities, what one is really hoping to bring about is a richer development of democracy altogether. That is, we are hoping to promote more widespread individual maturity, from which wider and richer degrees of independent choice and living from a rich and free center may come. Such releases may come into conflict with the limitations which an acquisitive society, obsessed with its patterns of becoming, seeks to impose on human nature. A deeper concern with the dynamics of being, however, may help give our society a sense of significance which Western society at the moment seems dangerously to lack.

c. Using appropriate transitions and connectives

B. The writer and his audience

1. Recognizing an audience

2. Determining a speaking voice

a. Expressing physical point of view

b. Expressing mental point of view - attitude toward an idea

c. Expressing attitude toward audience

C. The writer and his style

1. Using Christensen's four rhetorical principles

a. Addition

b. Levels of abstraction

c. Movement

d. Texture

2. Selecting effective sentence patterns

a. Understanding language as a system of constants and variables

b. Providing proper balance

c. Achieving desirable emphasis

3. Using appropriate diction

4. Sensing rhythm and sound

D. The writer and his total purpose

1. Creating an appropriate tone

2. Persuading and arguing

3. Writing with fact and feeling

Paper on "Setting"

The term "setting" in England means the practice of taking students out of their main class-groups for certain subjects. Thus out of four parallel or streamed classes a school may form four (or perhaps five or six) groups or sets for science. To some extent, varying in each school, students are divided by ability and according to the general pattern of their studies; in most English secondary schools there is after the first two years or so a range of options which gradually becomes increasingly wide, particularly though not only for the United Kingdom equivalent of "college-bound" students. Certainly in many "sets" the choice may not reflect the same mental act for all students; for some it represents choosing work which genuinely interests them, for others it means finding themselves in a particular group because they were advised to - often because they weren't expected to be able to cope with the harder work being done in another set. Thus the picture is a mixed one. Setting as a rule does not involve as much ultimate social differentiation as "streaming," but in its present form it undoubtedly reflects some of the same aggravating factors - restriction, selection, examination-tracks, cramming, premature failure. Both pros and cons are real.

How does all this affect English? Setting, like streaming, cannot be considered from an English angle conclusively and regardless of other subjects. Some of us would value the variety of choice which the English secondary school has to offer, and would wish to retain a degree of setting in the school of the future with its "workshop" approach; here is one of the chief means of obtaining variety. Others may wish to abolish setting along with streaming.

Probably most of us would agree that the immediate need is to think and experiment further about the implications, short term and long term, of setting and the workshop approach in their mutual relation. And we must see that teacher training gives some guidance on both.

Regardless of what we may want as individuals, some degree of choice is likely to be with us for some time yet, if only because we are not in the foreseeable future likely to be able to lengthen the very short British university course leading to the first degree; for most students this is only three years long, and presupposes that some of the university ground will have been covered before the student reaches university.

How does all this affect the U.S. picture? The real questions appear to be "what is the place of variety in the curriculum; what is the scope of student choice; what are the implications for English?"

7. Record of Group Discussion

You taught me language and the profit on't
Is I know how to curse.

Caliban

I. August 25

The Working Group began its first session by feeling round some of the edges so as to assess the dimensions of its task. We found ourselves all concerned with the way in which our central problem depends upon the universities; whatever reform may be needed, it is unlikely to come with university work organized as it is at present; we felt that too little attention had been paid in the initial sessions to universities and their approach to English; more thought and research are needed here.

Our interpretation of the group's task must depend on our conception of English; we should look to Group 1 for definitions, but meanwhile ask ourselves what we meant by English. Not that definitions are easy; it would be easier to consider aims, what English teaching is trying to do. What makes English teaching so difficult is the degree to which, as in no other subject, it takes over and must build on so much that a child has already achieved before coming to school. Not all children started at school from the same point. On the other hand, wherever children started, there could only be one approach, a taking further of what was already begun, helping the child to enlarge and add to this beginning - there must be connection between his new occupations and his preschool uses of language and the new must hold his interest. This meant that teachers must be prepared to work <u>with</u> children, rather than at them, exploring the new situation together.

Would such exploration lead in the same direction for each child? Not necessarily. But exploration in such a mood should concern the same kind of experience, touch the same springs of interest and energy, and lead to results of the same kind for all children. Unfortunately many teachers, perhaps out of insecurity, seem to resent the very idea of such an approach to teaching; the dais is far from disappearing. And a particular aspect of insecurity was the preoccupation with external skills imposed from above (not the only way of acquiring them) as well as a frequent deep seated philistine resentment of the aesthetic side which cannot be imposed from above and is therefore too often relegated to "frill" status. Parents, Heads, and the outside world may make matters worse; but so far they have been given little idea of what teachers should be trying to do, and can do - or why, what is at stake.

i the deepening and enriching of inner ('psychic') life.

ii all aspects of communication as they bear upon a child, centered always upon his own world.

iii delight in language and in using it well; at first natural and later for granted.

Another aspect, running in and through these, particularly the first two, should be a gradually developing sense of perspective which would help to link the individual with others and develop his sense of belonging to something past as well as present.

Such a conception of English and approach to English precluded traditional "streaming" at any stage; it would, however, be compatible with much of the

thinking which in the U.S. underlay the "tripod" of literative, language, and composition. It should also be compatible with serious university studies; the past has shown that an enormous amount of time was being wasted on the way to the university and above all in freshman English; students too often reached it bored and with the wrong values. The universities were on the defensive, and if they did nothing to tackle their own problems, student boredom would increase as English in the schools improved.

Of course the point of view we have expressed is that of a minority. But we shall be satisfied if on this side we can give aid and comfort to the minority; if one or two first-rate books should emerge from the seminar, they would make an impact which should not be underestimated.

When the forst of folly fall,

Find they body by the wall.

II. August 26

A short session which centered upon teaching problems.

The kind of approach we envisaged in our first meeting can help the teacher who, at present, so often seems unable to use his intuition; so many teachers just aren't human. They over-explicate, analyze too much, and above all seem unable to know when to stop; a little initial explanation may help the student as nothing else can, but how does a teacher get the sureness of touch which will prevent him from going too far? Of course, this is partly a matter of practice. But the main essential - apart from knowledge and awareness of the subject - is surely tact and human understanding. This would see, for example, the latent possibilities of some of Emily Dickinson's poems and the way - relevant for adolescents - in which she did and did not

grow up; her oblique approach can be very congenial to young people. But no single subject is ideal for all classes or groups of a given age; there must be time for the calculated digression or to allow the student to revert to something which in theory he has left behind, like nursery rhymes, if need arises. So external planning, for the individual or for his department, must allow for such things much more than it does now. And we must get away from the sense of guilt, which troubles so many teachers, preventing them from allowing their classes to enjoy the work. If any single reform is needed in English, it is the reintroduction of pleasure into what is done in the English period.

There may seem an apparent paradox here. You need to be something of a scholar, to know your material, if you are to teach others; at the same time you must know how to keep your knowledge in the background, to come to the work in hand freshly, and to divine the minds of the students in class or group. In England at the present time the most enlightened thinking along such lines is to be found in Colleges of Education. Some of these show that they appreciate the degree to which the study of literature can in itself be part of the ultimate educational experience - for literature is ultimately about human beings, what they are like, what their values are, and how they behave, and the study and teaching of this side of English should form a central part of the experience of teaching. It is here that scholarly understanding and awareness of children should meet. Would the new B.Ed. degree being introduced for the abler College of Education students in close association with the university recognize the college's progress in this field, and the need for it, or would a promising new development be swamped under the old university rigmarole?